

THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 1.

JANUARY, 1890.

No. 4.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE DISPENSATION OF THE LOGOS.

BY WILLIAM M. TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D., MINISTER OF THE BROADWAY TABERNACLE, NEW YORK CITY.

THE prologue to the fourth Gospel is remarkable for its unequalled combination of simplicity of language with profundity of thought. It may be read with ease by a child not long out of the alphabet; yet it cannot be fully comprehended even by the greatest human intellect. Like a cloudless summer sky, it is a clear infinite, whose depths are in part revealed and in part also concealed by the dazzling brightness of the sun which shines in it, and which is so succinctly described in the words: "That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." It bears the same relation to the Gospel of which it is the introductory section that the enunciation of a proposition in mathematics does to the demonstration which follows it, for it sets fully before the reader the truth which its author designs to establish in the succeeding chapters. Indeed, the fourteenth verse, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth," may be regarded as the text of the treatise. To the proof of the assertion made in these words every subsequent section contributes its own distinctive quatum, until at last the author is enabled to conclude with a Q. E. D. in this fashion: "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name."

But in order that this fourteenth verse itself might be, in some degree, intelligible, it was needed that some preliminary statements should be made regarding him who in it is called "the Word," and these not only make clear to us who that person is, but also cast a flood of light on some other subjects which have perplexed the minds of thoughtful men. We cannot go into the consideration of all of these here, but in this

brief paper we will confine ourselves to what we may call the Dispensation of the Word, or, to prevent ambiguity and using the Greek term, the Dispensation of the Logos.

Much has been written by learned men upon the Logos, and various explanations of the use of that term by the evangelist have been suggested. Some have traced it to the Jewish Targums, which describe those appearances of the "Angel of the Lord" that are recorded in the Old Testament as so many manifestations of the Word of God (Memra Jehovah). Others have alleged that its use by John is to be accounted for by the fact that Philo of Alexandria spoke much in his system of the Logos; while others still have referred it to the frequent recurrence in the writings of the Jewish prophets of the phrase, "The word of the Lord came to me," understanding by the expression "the word of the Lord" not an influence, nor a verbal communication, but a Person. It is difficult—perhaps we ought to say impossible—for us now to determine which of these theories, or whether any of these theories, is correct; all we really know on the subject is contained in this prologue, and on the very surface of that the following things are patent to every reader—viz., that the Logos is God; that he is yet in some way so distinct that it can be said regarding him that he was in the beginning with God; that he was the Maker of all things; that he had life in himself, which life was the light of men—"the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world;" and that he became incarnate in the Person of Jesus Christ, who dwelt among men full of grace and truth, and was recognized as having the glory of the only begotten of the Father.

It is impossible to conceive of any stronger assertion of his Deity than this: "The Logos was God;" while if, as we sincerely believe, the doctrine of the Trinity is scriptural

and true, we can at least, in some degree, understand how it can be affirmed that "the Logos was with God." For the rest, the appropriateness of the name Logos is apparent in the fact that he to whom it belongs is especially and peculiarly the Revealer of God. Thought is communicated only through word. Until it is thus—so to say—inverbated, it is hidden from all but the thinker himself; but when it is inverbated, it becomes intelligible to others, and can be apprehended by them. So Deity, in the abstract, is unrevealed. Only through the instrumentality of the Logos has he made himself known unto men, and so he through whom this revelation has been made may be fitly termed the Logos or Word, bearing as he does to the godhead the same relation which utterance does to thought. So, however we may account for the choice of such a term by John, whether he took it from Philo, or from the Targums, or had it directly suggested to him by the inspiring Spirit, the meaning of it in his hands is clear, and seems to us to be fully displayed by him when, in the last verse of the prologue, he says: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, *he hath declared him.*"

But now, having got hold of the significance of the term, the question faces us, "When did the Dispensation of the Logos begin?" and we find the answer in these words, "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose that the revelation made by God through the Logos commenced with the Incarnation. The truth rather is that the Incarnation divides the Dispensation of the Logos into two periods: one the pre-incarnate and the other the post-incarnate. Now, the pre-incarnate, as the words just quoted make clear, commenced with the creation. That was the first "thought" of God which was made articulate by the Logos; and so soon as there was a human mind to apprehend it, that mind received from it some idea of the existence, the power, the wisdom, and, in a large sense also, the goodness of God. We talk, indeed, of natural as distinguished from revealed theology, and there is value in the discrimination made between the two. But yet, if we fully take in the teaching of the Evangelist in this prologue, we see that even that which men may learn regarding God from the external universe and from the intuitions of their own souls is itself a revelation made to them through the creation of all things

by him who is the Logos. There never was a time, therefore, when the human race was absolutely destitute of a revelation, and for what of revelation they had from the beginning, they were indebted to the Logos.

Nor was it only through the external world that the Logos made a revelation of God by the creation. We must trace to the same source all those intimations of the existence, the nature, and the character of God which were given to men through conscience and the intuitions of the human mind. And if it be asked how much was comprised in such a revelation, Paul will help us to an answer in these words: "The invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made, even his eternal power and Godhead;" and these others; when speaking of the heathen, he says: "These, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness."

Still further, the revelation, through the instrumentality of the pre-incarnate Logos, was made through history. That was very clearly the case with the Jewish nation; for that which was taught them by the prophets was given to the prophets, as Peter tells us, by "the Spirit of Christ in them;" and the Spirit of Christ in that connection must denote the spirit of the pre-incarnate Logos. To him, therefore, has to be traced all the revelation of God's nature, and of the relation of Israel and of men generally to God, which was given to the Jews in the Old Testament Scriptures.

But it was not among the Jews alone that the Logos was at work revealing truth to men, for Providence is universal, and we cannot doubt that all through the times before the advent of the Messiah, Providence, which is simply God, through the instrumentality of the Logos was carrying on a work of preparation as really among the nations at large as among the Jews. He did it among the Jews, indeed, through a special agency and in a miraculous manner; while he did it among the other nations through the common operations of his moral government, and without any miracle; but it was HIS working in both. Every nation had its own book of Leviticus, teaching the doctrine and regulating the practice of animal sacrifices. Among the heathen that book was not given by an inspired man like Moses, but each nation had what was virtually such a book, and it was as real, though certainly not as clear a forepointing to "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," in

the one case as in the other. Then, in other respects, there were what Archbishop Trench, in one of his earliest works, so suggestively called "the unconscious prophesies of heathendom," all of which must be traced to the working in them and among them of the pre-incarnate Logos. Thus in manifold ways and over the whole world the Logos, even before the birth of the Messiah, was revealing God to men, and so he is most accurately described as "the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

Then, passing to the post-incarnate period of this dispensation, we need not spend long time in treating of the revelation given by the Logos in that. In his character the visible Christ manifested the Invisible God, so that he could say to Philip, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." By his words he made known the love of God to the world. By his death he shewed how Jehovah is a just God, and yet the Saviour of sinful men. By his resurrection from the dead he took its sting from death and its victory from the grave, and brought life and immortality to light. But what need is there for us to say more here? If we were to attempt to give an exhaustive account of the truths revealed by the Incarnate Logos, we should have to classify and arrange all the statements contained in the New Testament, and all the doctrines which have been discovered in that wonderful book in those eighteen centuries of history, during which the abiding Spirit of Christ in the church has been teaching Christians through the opening of their understandings to understand the Scriptures.

Thus the Dispensation of the Logos in its two periods—the pre-incarnate and the post-incarnate—is a much wider thing than is generally supposed, and the two together comprise the history of the human race from the creation on till the consummation of all things.

Now, having reached this landing-place, let us pause in our investigation and take note of what we have learned. If the representation which we have given is correct, then it will follow that man has at no period been ever wholly without light. The first revelation was through the creation, and that has remained everywhere ever since. Men's minds, through sin, may not always have been equally able or equally willing to take in all that they might have learned of God from the material universe, or from conscience, or from history. But the light has always been there in some degree. If men shut their eyes, or did not

like to retain God in their knowledge, that was their guilt; but there was always some light; and to that agree the words of Paul to the men of Lystra, "Nevertheless God left not himself without a witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness."

Then, further, wherever there was light, and that was everywhere, and in whatever degree the light was enjoyed, we have learned that the Illuminator was the Logos. When one of the English Deists wrote a book, with the view of proving that Christianity is as old as the creation, his thesis, as he wished it to be understood, was not true. But, as we have seen, the revelation of God through the Logos began at the creation, and so the inference is clear that, wherever light is, there is Christ as the Logos. So the heathen before the advent came, and the heathen to-day, in so far as they have any true light as to God and duty and responsibility come, into contact with Christ. The heathen to-day are precisely in the same position as the heathen of old were. They are virtually under the dispensation of the Pre-incarnate Logos; but even so, it is still the Logos—the Spirit of Christ—that they have to do with.

So far we have followed the teachings of this section of John's Gospel; but that we may bring our examination to bear on some present currents of thought among us, we introduce here another statement, which, though not contained in this prologue, may be clearly deduced from other portions of Scripture. That statement is that the degree of light enjoyed is the measure of the responsibility incurred. This is evident from the words of our Saviour concerning Chorazin and Capernaum. The inhabitants of these cities had enjoyed greater privileges, or, in other words, more light than all who had gone before them, and because they had loved darkness rather than light He affirmed concerning them that it should be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon, yea, for Sodom and Gomorrah, than for them. Both would be condemned, and both would be punished, yet not both equally punished; for the punishment of each would be according to the light of each. We are familiar with the thought that there will be degrees of glory in heaven; but the corresponding thought that there will be degrees of punishment among the lost has largely fallen out of view among us in these later days, and much of the perplexity that is felt by many on the subject of retribution is owing to that fact. There is one clear principle of

the Divine administration applicable to all men alike, no matter at what age of the world's history they may have lived or in what land their lot may have been cast, and that is, that the degree of light enjoyed by each is the measure of the responsibility incurred by each. If a man has prized his light, and walked according to it, he will be accepted of God and saved at last, and his salvation will still be through Christ as the Logos, who has given him, or rather who is himself, that Light. If, on the contrary, a man has despised that light—no matter how small it may have been—and walked contrary to it, he will be condemned at last, and condemned because he has rejected Christ, who, as the Logos, was the Light that he enjoyed. Men do not need to have what has been called the "historic Christ" preached unto them in order to be brought into contact with Christ, for the Light, no matter what its degree, which they possess, is Christ, who, as the Logos, has in greater or smaller measure lighted every man that cometh into the world, and the principle underlying the words, "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much," warrants the dealing with all in the manner which we have described. There needs, therefore, no prolongation of probation into the future state in order that Christ may be preached to those who have not articulately heard of him on earth; for all have come really into contact with Christ who have had any degree of light, and their treatment of the little light which they had is evidence of the treatment which they would have given to more light if they had possessed that. Thus all men everywhere are dealt with on precisely the same terms, and God's justice is so conspicuously manifested as to need no vindication.

The practical outcome of all this, so far as we are concerned, is this, that if the degree of light is the measure of responsibility, then a very solemn responsibility must rest upon us. Never any people had such privileges as those which we enjoy. We have the Scriptures "in our own tongue wherein we were born," and we have perfect freedom to read them and to obey them. The special favors bestowed on the Hebrew nation were small in comparison with ours, so that, if we despise our opportunities and fail to improve them, our guilt will be greater even than that of those who crucified the Lord of glory and put him to an open shame, and our punishment must be of the heaviest. It were well, therefore, that we should give over speculations about the des-

tiny of others, and concentrate our thoughts and efforts on the doing of our own duty. Let us give over asking the question, "What shall this man do?" and set ourselves earnestly to follow Christ. Let us cease to speculate on the question, "Are there few that be saved?" and strive ourselves "to enter in at the strait gate," for our primary responsibility, at least, is for ourselves.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE ASSAULT ON THE MONASTERIES IN ENGLAND UNDER HENRY VIII.

(Condensed translation, by Rev. C. C. Starbuck, from the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*. III. Quartalheft, 1889.)

THIS article is founded on Aidan Gasquet's work, which rests upon protracted study of the original archives in the British Museum, as well as of those found in other libraries, both of Great Britain and the Continent.

Several Protestant writers, such as Brewer, and Dixon, and Blunt, who had preserved a good measure of historical impartiality, had already found reason to question the current English representations of the state of the monasteries under Henry VIII. They accuse the reports of the visitors sent out by Thomas Cromwell as teeming with untruths and monstrosities. Brewer allows that many causes concurred why the monasteries in England could no longer flourish as in their prime, "but the corruption was not so black and universal as party spirit would persuade us."

To say that P. Gasquet has arrived at the same results would be stating it inadequately. Gasquet, though in various points coinciding with Brewer, has made a far more extended study of the scenes attending the suppression, and has adduced a multitude of invincible proofs, such as set the proceedings against the monasteries in a wholly new light.

Gasquet, whose work, both in form and matter, has been acknowledged, both in England and Germany, as a historical work of the first rank, avows, of course, that his sympathies lay in a definite direction, but declares that he has taken the greatest possible pains to let facts speak for themselves, being convinced that in this case they are more eloquent than anything else. His book, with the weapons of modern research, sets forth with convincing energy the cruelty of Henry Tudor, the vileness of his motives, and the absolute worthlessness of the agents

who wreaked this cruelty upon multitudes of devout and harmless men and women.

2. Henry's suppression of the religious houses had had various *precedents* in England. Since the Conquest, the English kings had shown little regard to the liberties of the Church, as witness Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket, and Edmund Rich, Archbishops of Canterbury. In 1294 Edward I., then at war with France, suppressed eighty or one hundred monasteries (mostly Cluniacs), banishing the monks as foreigners, but keeping their goods. His two successors recalled them. When, in 1312, Clement V., having suppressed the Templars, promised their possessions to the Hospitallers, Edward II. refused to execute the decree, and secured an act of Parliament for appropriating—ostensibly for pious uses, according to the mind of the founders—all these “masterless estates” to the Crown.

Edward III. began, it is true, by restoring most of the suppressed “alien priories.” But needing money for his French wars, he in 1337 laid his hand upon “the foreign houses,” not forgetting, moreover, to give sops to his nobility out of their goods. Not till peace was concluded, in 1361, was a part of the alienated estates given back. Henry IV. reversed some sequestrations of Richard II., restoring thirty-three monasteries, but in 1402 appropriated a part of their incomes toward maintaining “the king's household,” while, at the instigation of the Wycliffites and Lollards, proposals were already broached in Parliament and the Privy Council for a general suppression of the monasteries and a restriction of church property in general.

In 1405, in the Parliament whose Socialistic and Wycliffistic vein has brought it into disrepute as “the unlearned Parliament,” the Speaker proposed to secure a rich supply to the empty treasury by a general ecclesiastical confiscation. Only the energetic remonstrances of Archbishop Arundel, and his humble representations to the King, averted the danger. The King, however, indemnified himself out of the “vacant bishoprics and abbeyes.” Indeed, Henry V., in 1413, and Henry VI., in 1437, received papal permission, on political grounds, to suppress the Cluniac (and some Carthusian) monasteries of French monks, and to apply their goods to the benefit of other houses, as well as to the foundation of colleges in Eton, Winchester, Oxford, and Cambridge, with the obligation, however, of suitably indemnifying the foreign owners. Henry VII. was allowed some similar privileges toward reduced houses. Finally,

Henry VIII., conjointly with Wolsey, in 1521 suppressed Bromehall Nunnery, on an unproved charge of scandals, alleging, *pro forma*, the concurrence of the now beatified John Fisher. Fisher in 1524, it is true, suppressed a nunnery of his own diocese, whose nuns, reduced to three, afforded reasons, both moral and canonical, for the suppression.

Yet all these precedents are a trifle to the violences which Wolsey began to exercise, agreeable to his haughtiness and ambition. Having secured the Archbishopric of York, the Cardinalate, and, finally, after the saintly Archbishop Warham, of Canterbury, the Chancellorship, he seemed at the summit of his desires. Yet he tried to importune the Pope into appointing him Legate, with supreme right to visit all monasteries, even exempt ones. Bribery was to help; he transmitted to the English agent ten thousand ducats, *propter liberalia*. Leo X., however, did not consent, but in 1518 sent Campeggio to England as Legate. The exasperated Wolsey, however, so wrought upon Henry that he fairly intimidated the Pope into naming him joint Legate. He knew that on English ground he could easily extinguish the Italian Campeggio. At last the bull giving Wolsey the right of Visitation of the Religious Houses was issued at the end of 1518. This put into the hands of the English Chancellor such an authority as scarcely ever a Prince of the Church has had. His almost unbounded influence over Henry made him almost as good as king; as Legate, who had, moreover, extorted from the Pope extraordinary powers, he was supreme ecclesiastical governor of the realm. Thus, uniting both swords in one hand, he was well described as ruling both king and kingdom, and as being seven times as high in repute as if he were pope.

He used his new power at first creditably. In 1519 he gave the Augustinian Regular Canons new statutes, which, without complaining of any previous laxity, reinducted strict observance. He found, neither in monks nor nuns, any sign of disaffection. Only the Franciscans of the Strict Observance did not relish an interruption of their close connection with their General in Rome.

In 1524 his official visitation changed its character. Leo the Tenth's death drew Wolsey's own ambition to the vacant chair. Officers, secular and ecclesiastical, were in commotion; nor were simoniacal means forgotten. How little faith can Wolsey have had in the exalted character and the sacred duties of such a dignity! His disappoint-

ment rendered him only the more imperious toward the new Pope, Clement VII. He required him, in an almost menacing tone, to confirm to him Leo's grant of powers. To his bishoprics, a mandate of the King now added the incomes of the great abbey of St. Alban's, compulsorily held vacant.

He next demanded a bull giving him discretionary rights of suppressing religious houses. With the revenues he intended to gain the credit of a great lord and princely founder, by erecting colleges at Oxford and elsewhere. This bull was, of course, refused; yet Clement yielded so far as to authorize Wolsey, in favor of Oxford, to suppress some almost extinct houses, yet on condition of their consent and the King's, provided the monks were most considerately treated, and well provided for in other houses. This measure was very lucrative to Wolsey, but in Kent and Sussex and other southern counties it provoked a veritable tempest of popular displeasure. There were even insurrections, when Archbishop Warham's remonstrances to Wolsey had availed nothing. The Duke of Suffolk (the King's brother-in-law), Sir Thomas More, and other men of note expostulated both with Henry and Wolsey over the reckless manner in which the Cardinal's agents proceeded, especially Allen and Thomas Cromwell, afterward so notorious. The monasteries, these gentlemen said, were "a help to the people," and dearer to them than had been supposed; their superiors, too, were in good repute as virtuous men. All in vain. The agents hastened from house to house, and even where they could find no pretext for suppression, induced the superiors of various monasteries, by threats and false reports, to advance large sums as a means of averting secularization.

The ominous example of the Cardinal Legate, notwithstanding that Henry for the moment (in 1527) expressed himself very disapprovingly, was not to fail of its effect upon the covetous Tudor.

Early in 1527 the King, we well know why, began to entertain scruples as to the validity of his marriage. In the autumn began the negotiations with the Pope, then shut up in St. Angelo with some cardinals after the sack of Rome in May by the Constable Bourbon. Wolsey, availing himself of Clement's straits, urged on him the granting of unexampled powers. Gardiner, his agent, threatened, in case of non-compliance, that they would settle church matters in England without the Pope. He also extorted extensive powers for Francis I. All

the monasteries were to be suppressed, and, where occasion required, cathedrals to be erected in their place. When the Pope gave a preliminary consent to this disposition of some monasteries, but required first exact reports of them, Wolsey's agents shamelessly urged against these the vilest calumnies. The next year Clement fell sick, and on a false report of his death Henry VIII. left neither influence, bribes, nor threats unused to put Wolsey in his place. Indeed, his instructions make clear that, if disappointed, he meditated *setting up Wolsey as Antipope, and so inaugurating a schism*, as the Emperor intimated, in great perturbation over the Pope's health. Clement, however, to the great disappointment of both Henry and Wolsey, recovered. It now appeared that in the bulls issued in 1528 at Wolsey's urgent instance, the Chancellor's agent had falsified and enlarged the numbers of the monasteries in question. Wolsey now insisted on the omission of the clause *de quorum consensu interest*. The Pope consented, declaring, however, that, agreeably to the King's wish, full power was given to suppress monasteries for the founding of new bishoprics and cathedrals, but that, in case wrong should be done to any in the execution, the conscience of the Cardinal Legate must remain charged.

However, the days of the mighty Chancellor and Legate were numbered. Wolsey never had opportunity to use his enlarged authority. Forty-four Articles of Impeachment were exhibited against him in the Parliament, five relating to his violent proceedings against the monasteries. They allege that the Chancellor Legate, having, by false representations, extorted from the Pope exorbitant powers, had in practice far exceeded even these. He had shamelessly, it is declared, "suppressed over thirty houses by driving virtuous men out of their home;" had only conceded the choice of abbots and priors on payment of impoverishing imposts, thus withdrawing from the monasteries the power of exercising hospitality and helping the poor, so that the land was overrun with beggars, vagabonds, and thieves, who had formerly had their wants met from the revenues of the convents.

It seems impossible to doubt that the supremacy of the State over the Church and the entire confiscation of monastic possessions, as afterward carried through under Thomas Cromwell, is to be mainly regarded as a fruit of the lamentable seed which Wolsey sowed.

3. THE FRANCISCANS.—In treating of the suppression of the religious houses, we can-

not pass over the execution of the so-called Holy Nun or Maid of Kent, Elizabeth Barton, inasmuch as it has often been asserted that the behavior of this nun and of her clerical associates (certain Benedictines, Franciscans, and secular priests) first irritated the King against the regular clergy. New light has been cast on the fate of the unhappy nun by official documents published in England, and others discovered by P. Gasquet.

Referring to an earlier dissertation for full particulars, we would simply say here that Gasquet, eliminating popular rumor, shows that what was actually foretold actually came to pass. The beatified bishop John Fisher relates that the nun declared that unless Henry repented he would in seven months no longer be King of England. And in seven months the adulterer was actually excommunicate, and thereby, according to ecclesiastical law, and English law in particular, had forfeited crown and regal dignity. It is also shown that it was through a fictitious confession of hers that the Blessed Thomas More was led to blame himself for having given credit to her, and, alas! was brought at last, with her Benedictine friends of Canterbury, even to declare the devout and innocent maiden a hypocrite.

The Parliament of 1534 had to deliberate on measures looking to the total extinction of the papal jurisdiction over England. Above all, Henry was eager for the *Church possessions*, which he appeared inclined to view as his patrimony. Among the provisions by which the supreme ecclesiastical power was conveyed to the King was one to the effect that the Crown should henceforth enjoy that unrestricted right of visiting the monasteries and fraternities which the Pope had exercised, together with the absolute right to dispose of their goods. It is declared with special emphasis that no bishop or archbishop or other person shall presume to regulate the monasteries without royal consent, or to act as their patron—an exemption of a new sort, and that the worst!

It might have been expected that in the higher clergy, especially among the Bishops, there would be found men that would intervene for those thus threatened, and apprise the Christian people of the designs of the Government, and the danger threatening the faith. But so confused were men's minds as to the extent of the Crown's ecclesiastical prerogatives, that even bishops of undoubted catholicity are found soliciting the royal license for the exercise of their purely ecclesiastical functions! When, therefore,

the King gave orders to preach publicly against the Pope, there was no longer any noticeable resistance. Henry's instrument, the ever-pliable Cranmer, most emphatically inculcated the command in "his Archdiocese." The people disliked such preaching, but many parish priests were frightened into it.

Yet the preachers from among the regular clergy were not so easily perverted into organs of royal tyranny and pseudo-episcopal charges. In London the Franciscans of the Strict Observance, called Observants, were especial favorites as popular preachers. They declared themselves with great frankness and steadfast energy against Henry's ecclesiastical policy. Two of them had already, as "Confederates of the Holy Maid of Kent," with two Benedictines and two secular priests, attained the crown of martyrdom. There were six houses of Observants in England, that at Greenwich enjoying the chief reputation for good discipline and blessed fruits in the office of preaching. Here the divorced Queen Catherine had, in better days, daily attended the offices and the Holy Mass, and often Matins at night. Here, too, she had chosen an enlightened confessor in the person of the saintly P. Forest.

These monks energetically rallied to the banner of orthodoxy. They especially defended the validity of Henry's first marriage. The two unhappy traitors, John Laurence and the lay brother, Richard Lyst, having apprised Cromwell, the superiors, Forest and Pecoek, were thrown into prison; Peto and Elstow banished; Payn and Cornelius, returning from a visit to the lawful Queen, were thrown into prison, but nothing appearing against them, were soon released.

To ascertain the temper of the Friars Observants, with a view, if he disliked it, to their punishment or expulsion, Henry, despite their protest, named the Dominican John Hilsey and the Augustinian-Eremit George Brown as Provincials and Visitors of their houses, and subsequently rewarded them as compliant instruments with bishoprics, naming Hilsey as the Blessed John Fisher's successor in the see of Rochester, and making Brown Archbishop of Dublin.

The Visitors, *ex gratia regis*, proceeded at once to fulfil their mission in the houses of the Observants. They assembled the religious, and commanded them to swear to acknowledge Anne Boleyn as lawful Queen, to take oath to the King's supremacy, to acknowledge Cranmer as Archbishop, to preach after the King's instructions, and to give in an inventory of all movable goods

and church vessels of their houses. Immediately, encouraged by the proceedings of the Government and the unsettled times, worthless men, adventurers, apostate or apostatizing priests, discredited students, conscienceless officials, felt a vocation to act as Visitors on their own account. They forced their way into the defenceless houses of various orders, especially nunneries, pretending a royal commission, and advising prudent gifts to the King, to avert suppression. These threats and extortions inaugurated a reign of terror among the monasteries. The Government was so little concerned that Cromwell declared to a certain criminal that if he would only give information against the houses he might expect a pardon. This sharpened the inventive wit of all the villains in the land, and thenceforth the outrages against the monasteries knew no bounds. Almost incredible acts of violence of this kind are established by thoroughly authenticated documents.

Unquestionably some regulars gave way to the royal demands, but the great majority stood firm. The people applauded their manfulness; indeed, when a London preacher bade prayer for Anne Boleyn, everybody left the church.

Whatever partial success the two Commissaries or new Provincials might have in the other Franciscan houses of England, in Greenwich all their efforts were vain. The friars being reminded that, as non-exempt regulars, they owed obedience to the King and the Archbishop, these brave sons of the patriarch of Assisi replied: "Our rule gives us the Pope and his representative as our Superiors; all other authority, spiritual and secular, we acknowledge only so far as is consistent with God's law, the Pope's authority, and our Rule." The result was the suppression of the Observant houses and imprisonment of about two hundred monks. Fifty died of their privations; a good many, by intercession of influential friends, were in 1537 privately shipped off to France, Scotland, and Ireland. Indeed, Cromwell was glad at last to be rid of them. Thirty-two, bound two and two, were transported to the jails of different towns. Their further fate is known only to God.

The most famous of these brave men, the Blessed John Forest, Guardian of the Greenwich Convent and legitimate Provincial, remained, with some few intervals, from the spring of 1534 to that of 1538 in a mild imprisonment, being allowed to say mass and hear confessions outside the Tower. "But this," reports the pseudo-

bishop Latimer of Worcester to Cromwell, "seems only to strengthen him in his forwardness." This hastened the decision. The High Commission, consisting of Cromwell, Cranmer, and Latimer, in solemn session, pronounced the sentence that John Forest, being stubborn in maintaining the heresy of the papal jurisdiction and refusing to swear to the royal supremacy, shall, on May 22d, 1538, die the death of fire at Smithfield.

On the appointed day two great gallows were erected at Smithfield, over which in mockery the cause of death was set up. Between the two main beams was a hammock with great rings; underneath was the pile of wood, in sacrilegious sport mainly composed of a huge statue of St. David of Wales. At the appointed hour appeared the Lord Mayor, Richard Gresham, with his sheriffs; the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, the Lord Admiral and the Lord Keeper Cromwell, besides many members of Parliament and a numerous throng of the people; finally Latimer, whose duty it was to preach, in order to make a final effort for the "conversion" of Forest. But all his efforts were broken and foiled by the steadfastness of the holy man, who declared that if an angel from heaven came and preached another gospel than that which he had learned as a child, he would not believe him; and that if they hewed his members to pieces one by one or all together, and burned them, he would yet, by God's grace, not be moved from his persuasion, his confession of faith and his vows. All delay appeared profitless. Chains were cast about the body and under the arms of the hero of the faith. Thus suspended over the flames, he was roasted alive. In his fearful agonies, the tortured man strove to climb up the ladder, to withdraw his body a little from the fierceness of the heat. The heartless spectators and the chronicler Hall believed themselves to discover in this a token of his guilt. The fools!

4. THE CARTHUSIANS.—Although the sons of St. Bruno, living wholly secluded from the world in the Charterhouse in London, did not, like the pastorally active Franciscans, take an active part in the opposition to Henry's divorce, yet Cromwell, even during his conflict with the Franciscans, began to proceed vigorously against them. The fame of their personal sanctity and their well-known faithful devotion to the Holy See, and especially the report that the Prior of the Charterhouse, Father John Houghton, was accustomed privately to admonish his brethren and all his penitents to remain

steadfast in the ancient faith and the acknowledgment of the papal supremacy, was enough to bring them into suspicion with the King and his minister.

In April, 1534, two royal commissaries, Lee and Bedyll, appeared in the monastery and required all the monks to subscribe a declaration of the validity of Henry's new marriage and the right of Anne Boleyn's children to the Crown. Refusal was followed by the imprisonment of Houghton, the Prior, and Middlemore, the Procurator. Archbishop Lee and Bishop Stokesley, it is true, succeeded in convincing them that the succession of Anne's children was not a matter of conscience, whereupon they were released. Houghton declared, however, that it was divinely revealed to him that this was only a respite. All the monks finally took the oath, yet with the reservation, "so far as is lawful."

From this hour peace departed from the Charterhouse. Some were glad henceforth to shake off the yoke of discipline. One even turned traitor, and begged Cromwell's favor, already, he said, shown to one of his brethren, John Norton, who had a canonry.

The Prior of the Brigittine monks was deputed to complete the conversion of the Carthusians, taking them by one or two at a time. Six finally agreed "to hold with the King touching the Bishop of Rome."

Meanwhile arrived the year 1535, which, on January 15th, was to bring to the King the long-desired title of Supreme Head or Pope of the English Church, and with it unbounded power over all causes or persons ecclesiastical, and no less absolute power for suppression of civil rights and for extortionate imposts. Proceedings against the religious houses recommenced with new energy. Though some Carthusians had given way, by far the most remained steadfast to the Catholic Church and the Pope. The Prior admonished his monks to patient endurance and to a preparation of conscience, that they might be at any time ready. There followed a touching scene; all, on their knees, begged forgiveness of their mutual wrongs and failings. Two other Carthusian priors and a Brigittine monk, whom his "loyal" prior had not persuaded, were, with Houghton, thrown into the Tower. A petition for grace was their new offence.

All four refused the oath of supremacy. The court, however, scrupled to condemn them, until Cromwell burst into the hall in a rage, and threatened the judges in case of non-compliance. They were then adjudged guilty of high treason.

Between sentence and execution the royal

commissioners were busy in the Charterhouse to persuade the monks that had remained faithful to apostasy, but to no purpose.

May 4th the three priors, Houghton, Laurence, and Webster, and the Brigittine monk Reynolds, as well as John Hale, Vicar of Isleworth, a secular priest, were executed at Tyburn. The execution was attended with great display. The chief officers of the realm, the Duke of Richmond, the King's illegitimate son, the Duke of Norfolk, premier peer, and, indeed, almost the whole court were present. There were also present five knights with closed visors, one of whom, as the ambassador of Charles V. wrote home, was surmised to be the King, as the other four showed him extraordinary respect. The martyrs died with words of thanks to God for giving them grace to die for his name and the Catholic faith; they declared themselves ready to obey the King in all things lawful, but, above all, to be minded to fear God and to abide faithful children of the Church. The bodies of the heroes of the faith were quartered, the arm of Houghton, as a bloody and deterrent sign to his brethren, being placed over the entrance of the Charterhouse.

Immediately afterward three other Carthusians—Humphrey Middlemore, William Exmew, and Sebastian Newdigate—were imprisoned, loaded with chains and blocks, fearfully tortured, tried, condemned, tortured anew, and finally, at Tyburn, released by the executioner's hand from their sufferings.

During the next two years the Carthusian family was spared imprisonment, in the hope that a strict watch over them, friendly persuasion, followed by rigorous dealing and multiplied privations, would knead them into pliancy; unhappily not without success, inasmuch as two monks, Rawlins and Trafford, denied their conscience and went over to the King's side. Trafford was made Prior of the Charterhouse, which he afterward ceded, with all its estates, to the King. The other monks, however, would not acknowledge the jurisdiction of this Prior, *gratia regis*, so that thenceforth, as the historian remarks, every Carthusian in London was his own prior.

Yet neither good nor evil accomplished their aim. The spirit of the ancient Christian martyrs lived anew in the most of these monks, so that the King and his minister, if they would not own themselves vanquished, found themselves obliged to proceed to extremities. Five or six commissioners took up their abode in the monastery, to shut the monks out from all intercourse,

even among themselves, except with heretical disputants and preachers, while good books were withdrawn and heretical books urged, though vainly, upon them. Some were sent to "loyal" houses in the North, and some in London, in the hope of overcoming their consciences.

A year later, May 18th, 1537, the royal commissaries repaired to the Charterhouse, and summoned the still numerous monks to a Chapter. The prior Trafford, noted above, and twenty monks, took the prescribed oath. Only ten steadfastly refused—three priests, a deacon, and six lay brothers. They were condemned to endure in prison sufferings almost indescribable. A courageous woman of note, Margaret Clement, had leave of their keeper to tend them secretly. Disguised as a milkmaid, she made her way in, and was dismayed to find the pious men so helpless with hunger and chains that she herself had to put the food into their mouths. She thus prolonged the lives of the heroic sufferers for a few days.

When the King heard that the refractory monks had not yet yielded to famine, he set a still stricter watch. But even then the noble woman found means of helping them. She climbed the roof at night, broke it up, and by a string swung a basket of food around from mouth to mouth. Of course this could not last, and within three weeks nine of the sufferers succumbed to their sufferings. The tenth, Brother William Home, languished on during three years in squalor and wretchedness, and was executed in 1540 at Tyburn. Of the four sent North, two, John Rochester and James Walwerke, received the palm of martyrdom at York.

Thus, of the forty-eight original brethren of the Charterhouse, there were remaining twenty, with their Prior. They surrendered their house and estates to the King, receiving in return rather scanty pensions, and in 1539 were turned out of their home. One of them, Maurice Chauncey, fled to the Continent, and practised a vigorous life-long penance for his fault. He there wrote the history of his happier martyred brethren, unreservedly acknowledging therein his own guilt. The Church and monastery were granted by Henry VIII., in 1542, to two merchants, and Chauncey describes with horror the desecration of the holy places and the abomination of desolation in the sanctuary, and how the hallowed altar itself was abused for a gaming table.

5. THE VISITATIONS OF 1535-36.—We have somewhat anticipated. In the year in which the first Carthusians and their companions sealed with their blood their testi-

mony for their Church, the two great confessors, John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and the Chancellor, Sir Thomas More, likewise died the glorious death of martyrdom. Misfortune seemed now to break in upon England from every side. Strained relations abroad, disquiet and despondency at home, the most unfriendly summer in human memory, almost incessant rains, an almost total failure of the harvest, and consequent distresses of the tenantry, were an accumulation of evils in which the people saw Heaven's vengeance on Henry's crimes and on the slaughter of holy men.

Cromwell saw well that higher taxation was the nearest way to general rebellion. Scarcity was followed by pestilence, so that Parliament had to be prorogued for half a year. The public treasury was empty; profusion, embezzlement, and maladministration had so drained it that even the modest wants of the unfortunate Catherine of Aragon could not be met. Henry now cast his thoughts anew upon the treasures of the Church. Costly vessels and valuables of the cathedrals were offered as "presents" to appease his rapacity; but increase of appetite grew by what it fed on.

There came to maturity in the mind of the absolute ruler the plan, which he had once advanced but had not carried through against John Fisher's energetic opposition—namely, the suppression and expropriation of the "lesser Abbeys." "Once appropriate the lesser," said the now beatified Bishop, "and the greater must soon come after."

In the resolution to deliver a decisive stroke against the religious houses, Henry and Cromwell had a double end in view: (1) to destroy the "papal system," or the Roman Catholic Church on the soil of Britain, in its most impregnable citadels; (2) to appropriate to themselves the treasures wherewith the piety of the faithful had, during nine or ten centuries, enriched the monasteries and their churches.

Cromwell devised an oath of supremacy, the exact face of which it is no longer possible to interpret, but evidently intended to provoke a refusal, and thereby lay the monastic possessions open to confiscation. But he was disappointed. As the Carthusians had sworn, yet afterward died as martyrs for the faith, so now almost all the English regulars believed that they could reconcile the oath with their consciences, and therefore swore.

To understand this, and to avoid precipitately stigmatizing such a course of proceeding as weakness of character, and charging with defection from the faith men who were

of irreproachable life, and who in their time were accounted enlightened servants of God, we must carefully weigh the condition of the age and the workings of men's minds. It may be easy now to assume the black cap in judging all the clergy and laity of England, Fisher, More, and Forest excepted; for a discussion of three hundred years has solved many a perplexity. Yet this would be to hazard an unrighteous judgment. In the very year 1534 the highest dignitaries in Rome often judged Henry's proceedings with great mildness, and failed to find in it much that is now distinctly visible. Nay, we shall presently see that Paul III., as late as 1536, was very near apologizing to Henry VIII. for raising Fisher to the Cardinalate. And how it was possible in England to believe that one could take the oath with a reservation and yet remain Catholic, without any compromise of his faith, appears from the following. Among the State papers in the British Museum is a discourse delivered in 1539 by an Anglican bishop commissioned by Cranmer, in justification of the execution of several Benedictine abbots and monks. This openly declares that the oath which the abbots in 1534 and the Blessed John Houghton had believed themselves warranted in taking without prejudice to their salvation amounted to nothing, and left them still rebels to the King and servants of the Pope, inasmuch as they interpreted it only of obedience to the King in such points of Church usage as he had claimed from old the right to control as regulator of the temporalities of the Church, with the tacit allowance of the Pope.

How deeply, *per fas et nefas*, the English kings had for centuries made the Church feel their power, Albert du Boys has shown, and Cardinal Manning demonstrates that it is unreasonable to be too prompt to lay up against the heroes of the faith in the sixteenth century the acceptance of the first Oath of Supremacy. This oath, as this enlightened Prince of the Church points out, was an act whose significance is in our day unmistakable, but whose unchurchly, uncatholic sense was in the early days of Henry's persecutions as yet largely disguised and mitigated. Various schisms, the contemporaneous existence of several popes for a series of decades together during the two preceding centuries, and much besides that demanded a *reformatio in capite et membris*, had so bewildered the heads even of the most eminent theologians, like Peter d'Ailly and John Gerson (*de auferibilitate Papali*), that it is no wonder if English priests and monks

failed to apprehend the scope of a declaration prejudicial to the rights of the Pope, and believed they could subscribe it, with or even without reserve. Even the admirably instructed, finely trained, beatified martyr Sir Thomas More acknowledged that he had formerly believed that one could be a good Catholic and yet hold that the Pope has his jurisdiction not *jure divino*, but only *jure humano*; and how he had studied seven years long, until he had become clear as to the truth, and had attained to the right insight.

Indeed, the question as to the permissibility of certain political oaths is one of the most difficult in all theology. To pass over the latest controversies in Belgium, Germany, and Italy, we would only bring to mind that, as to this very matter of the English Oath of Supremacy, theologians as late as Bossuet's time were of very divided views. And toward the end of the last century, when the persecution which had raged under the French Reign of Terror was, under the Directory, much abating, and a new oath was prescribed, the Bishops of France (*e.g.*, Lefranc de Pompignan) believed that they and their clergy could take it unreservedly, while those of Belgium (*e.g.*, Cardinal Frankenberg) rejected it.

As soon as Cromwell and his master discovered that their plan of inducing all the monasteries to refuse the oath, meaning then to abolish them all with one stroke, was frustrated, they endeavored to reach their goal by degrees. First, special encouragement was given to every monk or nun to prefer charges against superiors, the costs of inquiry to be borne by the convent. Thus discipline was undermined and delation encouraged. If a superior, on such testimony of a disaffected subject, should be convicted of "disloyalty," the monastery might be suppressed and its revenues confiscated to the Crown.

Thus, in the autumn of 1535, five Commissioners made a fresh progress through the land—choice fellows, who were to justify their evil repute still more clearly by perjury, incest, church-robbery, and embezzlement. Their names are: Dr. Legh and Dr. Layton, two apostate priests; Audeley, Dr. London, and one Ap Rice. Their instructions included eighty-five points of inquiry and twenty-five injunctions, to be interpreted by themselves. As a specimen: (1) All regulars under twenty-four, or such older ones as had been professed under twenty, were to be dismissed; (2) all who remained were to be held to "strict enclosure"—that is, were not to go outside the

grounds of their house. Watchmen—jailers rather—were to see this precept vigorously carried through.

The British Museum still preserves such an instruction. The commissaries, on entering a monastery, were to assemble all its members in the chapter-house. They should then swear allegiance to King Henry, Queen Anne, and Anne's children, promising to teach the people accordingly. The Oath of Supremacy was then to be so explained as really to involve a new oath, which, however, was rejected in four-fifths of the houses, all "Reports" to the contrary notwithstanding. Then the Visitors should minutely inquire as to the style of preaching, especially as to the right exposition of Scripture. But, first and foremost, the Visitors were to make the most detailed and careful inquisition into the *possessions* of the convent, movable and immovable, valuables, church vessels, etc., exacting an oath to alienate nothing without government approbation, and to follow most punctually all the instructions of the commissioners.

The authentic reports of the commissaries to Cromwell, still extant in part, afford clear proof in what a reckless, rough, and cruel manner these discharged their office. The facts of seduction and violation of the nuns on the part of these unscrupulous Visitors decency requires us to pass over. Intimations of the worst sort are sufficiently afforded by the historians.

Many regulars and conventual superiors now submitted to the intimidations of power. The Commissary Layton reports to Cromwell, as to the Black Monks (the Benedictines): "In all other places whereat I come specially the black sort of devilish monks—past amendment—God hath withdrawn His grace from them." But if any one had a grievance, he was forthwith dispensed from all vows. Indeed, all were encouraged to throw off the cowl and marry, if they did not prefer a beggarly life in houses most of whose revenues the Crown had appropriated.

Monks and nuns on whom their vows had slight hold, and who were glad of an opportunity of evasion, were of course to be found. But they were the exception. The rule was: resolute opposition of all, as well superiors as subjects. The malcontents, therefore, were commonly advanced by Cromwell to be superiors of their houses and administrators of the revenues, as a transition to the cession of these to the exchequer. All monasteries, moreover, that wished to escape immediate dissolution had to pay heavily for delay.

6. THE SUPPRESSION OF THE "LESSER ABBEYS."—Early in 1536 died the unhappy Queen Catherine. The belief prevailed that she had been poisoned, and, if not at the suggestion yet with the knowledge of Anne Boleyn; at least so reports the Emperor's envoy. Yet the concubine was not long to enjoy her high eminence. Henry's inconstant favor having turned from her, Cromwell, from whatever motive, made haste to ruin her. Scarcely four months after the grave had closed over the pale form of Catherine, Anne's head fell by the sword on Tower Hill.

Meanwhile, Henry and his agents were making ready for a collective attack on the monasteries. This was to rest on an Act of Parliament; Cromwell, through his commissioners, had gathered a mass of reports—"comperts," *comperta*—touching the state of the religious houses. We may judge by the foregoing as to their worthlessness for the historian. Moreover, they are vague and inaccurate as to places, persons, and facts, and have throughout the stamp of vulgar calumny. Thus, one of the agents writes: "We *hope* (!) to find great corruption in the houses of the southern counties;" and in the report of the northern counties we read: "Everything, as in the south; we assume that in the monastery at York everything will be quite as bad and, if possible, even worse." Then follows a detailed description of revolting immoralities.

Luckily, however, these worthy agents betray only too plainly that their notion of an Inquiry was to write down whatever they thought most likely to meet the wishes of their principal. Layton, for instance, reports having, in fourteen days, traversed eight counties and visited eighty-eight monasteries! Consider that in those days of wretched roads eighty-eight monasteries were to be visited, their religious assembled in chapter, examined as to eighty-five points, twenty-five ordinances set forth and explained, and a precise inventory of all conventual property taken! Eighty-eight monasteries, dispersed over eight English counties, visited in this way within a fortnight! This Layton, then, must have had, from some source, the power of working wonders. That the lying fellow can have done nothing more than look at the most and then written down his own inventions or common fattle is plain. But what mattered that to Cromwell?

The reports of the Visitors were now, as professional history writers of England declare, gathered in a "Black Book" and presented to Parliament, and thus the Eng-

lish monasteries are declared to have been forever robbed of their good name on the ground of authentic evidence. For three hundred and fifty years the Acts and Protocols of the Parliament of 1536 were invoked as evidence that the monasteries in England under Henry VIII., on account of the abominable lives of their inhabitants, had entirely forfeited all claim to protection against royal caprice, and even against tyranny and spoliation. At the production of the "Black Book" a cry of indignant horror is supposed to have resounded through Parliament; it is assumed as proved officially, by an exact statement of facts, that two thirds of the English regulars were addicted to drunkenness, simony, and hideous immorality, and only a third—namely, the inmates of the great populous abbeys, had led a seemly life! But within a year these too "were all rotten, morally and physically past cure."

Gasquet proves now that through all these centuries English chroniclers, some in good and some in bad faith, had merely copied these stories from their predecessors, but that not one had taken in hand the authentic documents and tested them. In lieu of this, school-books have been so much the more zealously filled with all manner of blood-curdling legends of unchastity, secret murder, and all sorts of abominations, and thereby inspired the earliest years of youth with a pernicious horror of everything that bears the name of monkery. Acts provably or presumably laid before Parliament have not breathed a syllable to the effect that two thirds of the English regulars had led an evil life, nor yet has Parliament any more declared that one third—namely, the inmates of the greater Abbeys, had led a good one. Let us examine these parliamentary proceedings a little more closely.

The Parliament of 1536—mainly convened for the suppression of the religious houses—was a packed Parliament, not one freely chosen. Protests of towns or boroughs were simply ignored; persistency was rewarded with Newgate or the Marshalsea. But where an election could not be evaded, judges of elections, who knew their business, confirmed and annulled at Cromwell's nod. The resulting Parliament was essentially an assemblage of Henry's and Cromwell's creatures. A member inclined to express his own mind was simply *commanded* to remain at home.

The Upper House, as being hereditary, not elective, was less tractable. Besides some few secular lords still faithful to the Church, a number of abbots and bishops had

seats. The spiritual peers, though a minority, would doubtless have great influence. It is true, most of the sees were supplied with Henry's obedient servants, and any who showed an inclination to stand up for the rights of the houses were by royal autograph and Cromwell's messengers remanded to their dioceses. As for the *abbots*, the imperial ambassador Chapuys wrote home several months earlier that, as this Parliament was intended to suppress the Abbeys, the King meant to exclude from it all the abbots. No wonder, then, that a Parliament assembled in which, as Hallam says, "Both houses yielded to every mandate of Henry's imperial will; they bent with every breath of his capricious humor." Yet there sat in it not only upstarts, like Russell, but the heads of the greatest houses—Norfolk, Arundel, Shrewsbury, Suffolk, Fitzalan. But indeed compliance had already been promised a share of the spoil. Many a scruple bent to this fair prospect. Indeed, so "well affected" were they that, as we shall see, the King could afford to dispense with their formal decision, and in this case of "exception and necessity" content himself with the assent of the House of Commons.

The Bill for "the Suppression of the Lesser Houses" was—a most rare occurrence—laid by the King himself on the table of the Lower House. This was evidently meant to throw the supreme authority of the Crown and the weight of his person into the scale, in order to assure the desired result. Yet he graciously declared he did not want them to sway in their judgments by regard of his person. He would again appear before them in four days, and hear their opinion. But as scruples made themselves felt about suppressing all houses of less than two hundred pounds' yearly revenue, he summoned Parliament before him, and with angry looks, turning to right and left, thus addressed them: "I hear that my bill meets with obstacles; but I will have it go through, or I will have your heads." The Bill became law. One such putting of the question sufficed.

What were the *contents of the Bill*? The Parliament resolved that, in consideration of the report on the condition of the monasteries, it was to be accounted a work pleasing to God for the King simply to suppress every monastery whose yearly income did not amount to two hundred pounds, or, if wealthier, was occupied by fewer than twelve religious, and to apply the revenues to a better purpose, according to his discretion. Neither a written report on the state

of the monasteries nor the so-called "Black Book" was read or even produced in Parliament. This contented itself with the oral declaration of the King that the lesser houses were unworthy to continue in being, as well on account of their bad administration as by reason of the lewd behavior of the monks and nuns. Indeed, the best historians, on good proof, transfer the "Black Book" to the time of Queen Elizabeth. According to them it contained proposals for the best manner of an entire suppression of the Abbeys. It cites no documents or visitatorial reports, but is an *anonymous undated summary of what had been done and was still to be done*. But the lately discovered actual visitatorial reports are not used in it. The author of the mysterious book had merely recounted after hearsay, without proof, that at most a third of the English regulars led an honest life, while two thirds led a hideous life, spotted with murder of their brethren, suffocation of little children, unnatural lusts, falsification of records, and like abominations. Unhappily the book itself, if it ever existed, has been lost; the above statements are derived from the old chroniclers, who profess to draw from it. Its unhappy loss is commonly attributed to the time of Mary the Catholic and Cardinal Pole. It is doubtful, from early notices, whether it antedates Elizabeth's reign. Even good Catholics, like Lingard, have allowed themselves to be imposed on here, and therefore many good Catholics, and even priests of to-day, entertain very strange opinions as to the monasteries of that time, and would rather let the question of their guilt rest than run the risk of tearing open a cicatrized wound of the Church.

A "Black Book" or authentic *comperta* of the Visitors having never been produced before Parliament, the story of a "cry of horror" is an ill-devised fable. The King had declared, by word of mouth, that the houses were bad and deserved chastisement, and this was the sole basis for parliamentary action. And the Parliament showed its mistrust of the King's declaration by its delay, till brought to compliance by vehement threats. And, as the scanty contemporary accounts state, it took care to put its action on the express ground that the King declared the case to be so and so.

Hall's statement that the greater abbots voted for the suppression of the lesser houses, in hope of averting this fate from their own, and that the Bishops and the Lords exclaimed that their turn would come, that the lesser houses were thorns to be cut up, but the greater were rotten old oak-trees to

be hewn down, is convicted of fabulousness by the fact, supported by all accessible documents, that the Bill does not appear to have come into the Upper House at all.

Henry and Cromwell did their best, by sending skilful preachers about, to bring over public opinion to their side. These were to do their best to persuade the people that the monks were so evil in life as to make their suppression a work of piety. They even had mimes, in which some represented the monks, while another, representing the King, came near to smite off their heads. Or it was the Pope and Cardinals in effigy, whom the King would throw into the water. With such comedies both King and people diverted themselves.

The special preaching-place was in front of St. Paul's. Here all the London clergy must be present, and the hearers were urged to communicate what they heard to their families. Thus the gospel and the new faith were spread among the people. Even private expressions, not quite agreeable to government doctrine and policy, were severely punished.

Cranmer endeavored, and not without success, to sweeten the unpopular dealings with the monasteries to the popular taste by promising that the confiscated estates should long render other taxes superfluous.

7. THE COMPERTA MONASTICA.—Nothing is easier, especially among the crowd, than to calumniate an Institute or an Order, and nothing harder than to defend it by proving a negative. What, then, can be done with accusations three hundred and fifty years old, especially now that the authentic documents have mostly disappeared? Henry's own parliamentary declaration against the monasteries is nowhere to be found in writing. Yet this is the basis of the parliamentary action. This declaration, in turn, professes to rest upon the visitatorial reports. These, therefore, are the ultimate object of inquiry, especially the reports of Layton, Legh, Ap Rice, and London.

Fortunately, the *originals* of these are still in the British Museum. First, a great number of letters, written while on their rounds, addressed to Cromwell and others. Many of these had remained unpublished until examined by P. Gasquet. Besides, there is a volume of *Comperta*, the redaction of John, Ap Rice, from various sources, of which various copies were made for the King, Cromwell, and others. There are also special reports for several counties. In one they say outright that in some of the greater abbeys they could learn and accomplish absolutely nothing, for that supe-

riors and monks, as "genuine Pharisees," stood resolutely together, and would give them not the least satisfaction. They suggest, therefore, in view of their scantness of time, a later commission, *ad melius informandum*, a naïve admission as to the untrustworthiness of their own. Again, remarking that many irregularities may be assumed of York Abbey, one of them says: "I will, therefore, attest thus, to help you out of your perplexity." The character of these reporters is described by the Protestant Gairdner as one which takes peculiar delight in revelling at full in the details of unmentionable obscenities.

No doubt the Visitors here and there found discontented or unworthy monks and nuns, and accusers of others. Evidently, however, the commissaries took no pains to sift these charges by personal examination; indeed, their lack of time would not have allowed this had they been so disposed.

No Institute, not even the Church founded by the Holy Ghost, is free of grave faults. But it is plain that the *monastic orders as corporations* did not deserve the stigma which has been put upon them; that the charges against them were calumnies or, at best, exaggerations of actual shortcomings, supplied by the unclean fancy of the reports, with drastic amplifications. Nor must we forget that the abbots and monks of most houses positively refused to render to the Visitors any account whatever of their life or their possessions, deeming it beneath their dignity to hold any communication of self-vindication or self-excuse with such men as these agents of regal malice.

That the state of things was very far from being so bad as is commonly assumed is plain enough to see from the joy expressed by the Visitors when they now and then find a monk who promises ready compliance and a sum of money for the King and his minister on condition of being made Abbot or Prior of his house.

Nor must we forget that the Visitors, in their letters and *Comperta*, make no distinction between greater and lesser houses. They throw them all into one heap, as being equally corrupt and decayed. The King, however, was pleased to say before the Commons, on the ground of his agents' reports, that the lesser houses were stark naught, but that in the greater the rules of their orders and Christian morals were well observed. Apparently he and his crafty minister feared that if they made also an immediate attack upon such great and venerable abbeys as Glastonbury, Reading, St. Alban's, Bury St. Edmund, Westminster,

St. Augustine's at Canterbury—abbeys so intimately cohering with English history and so dear to the people as places of pilgrimage and centres of beneficence—the popular resistance would become dangerous. Therefore the monasteries must be devoured, like an artichoke, leaf by leaf.

We are to notice that after the Bill of Suppression had become law, and the Parliament and people had been prepossessed and stirred up against the lesser abbeys, the Visitors continued their visits, but had no more to say about moral corruption. Exact computation shows that before the legal suppressions they had reported only on two fifths of the houses; afterward, of one hundred and fifty-five monasteries, they attribute to fifty as their sole offence a superstitious custody of relics.

There is nowhere a complete list of the inmates of a single monastery of men or women. But the following is good evidence of a comparative regularity and contentment of the regulars. In the province of York there were seventy-one monasteries. But Legh and Layton, with all their pains, can only muster here fifty male and two female regulars who expressed a desire to return into the world. Thus not as much as one person to a monastery who meditates apostasy! Yet many houses had from thirty to sixty monks. And yet the inmates of the seventy-one monasteries are to pass for universally degenerate! From these examples we may judge the rest.

As to the trustworthiness of the Reports, we must weigh the character of the Reporters. Gasquet's and Gairdner's citations of letters show sufficiently that they were men who had absolutely no moral scruples, no sense of honor, whose only aim was to serve their own material interests and Cromwell's, even at the expense of honor and conscience. Blunt, an Anglican, says: "Seldom has a tyrant chosen meaner and more vulgar instruments for his mean and vulgar intents than Henry the Eighth for the monastic visitations. The reader, who, at the very first view, detects them in so many evident and impudent lies, is exasperated and greatly inclined not to believe a word they say." The slightest charge against them is their unscrupulous acceptance, admitted by Froude, of blackmail from the monasteries, which, if not offered, they extorted.

The deep and abominable indecencies with which the Commissioner Richard Layton defiles his reports bear witness to a

* All these citations from the English, being retranslated out of the German, are, of course, in no way verbally exact.

deeply bestialized nature. It is well said that a man of right feeling does not know how to defile his hands by contact with such letters. Layton, one of Cromwell's most serviceable agents, was an apostate priest. Legh was a young lawyer, whose colleague, Ap Rice, repeatedly complains of his haughtiness and vanity, of his avarice, and of his recklessness in formulating charges. Ap Rice seems to have been the least objectionable, but so obsequious that Cromwell never found matter of discontent with him. The fourth, London, was worthy of the first two, to say no more. He was accused of having offered violence to nuns at his first visitation, and subsequently there were proved against him perjury, unchastity—nay, incest, detected *in flagranti*. And on the evidence of such men alone were the regulars and their convents condemned.

8. THE SUPPRESSION OF THE REMAINING ABBEYS.—After the death of Queen Catherine in 1536, and the tragical end of Anne Boleyn, it was hoped that, the stone of stumbling being now removed, the King would be found inclined to reconcile himself with the Pope and the Catholic Church. The English ambassadors to France, as well as the foreign courts, openly expressed this expectation, and the English people made open demonstrations of their hope of a return, and that, the cause of offence being removed, the disinherited Mary would be declared heir to the Crown, and that England could return to the communion of the Church, from which it had been violently torn away. Pope Paul III. showed himself well inclined to make such advances as might facilitate a reconciliation. A very small interested minority apart, the English people, nobility, clergy, and burgesses, would have been thoroughly well content to see the Royal Supremacy and the pretensions of the monarch to rule over the consciences of his subjects and to exercise spiritual jurisdiction abolished. The difficulty lay in no abstract unwillingness of Henry to return within the former limits of the legitimate jurisdiction of an English King. What held him fast in heresy and schism was his insatiable need of money, and the consciousness, after all his lavishness of outlay, that he no longer either could or would make good the spoliation of the Church estates, which brought him in a yearly revenue of thirty-two thousand pounds sterling, accruing to him from the suppression of three hundred and seventy-six monasteries. Money, be it noted, had then twelve times its present

value. And those who knew Henry best were persuaded that he would do anything rather than pay back the stolen wealth.

Indeed, he had already established a Court of Augmentations, which should complete the transfer to the Crown of the escheated property, and smooth the path for the plundering of the yet subsisting Greater Abbeys. But he reckoned without his host. The London rabble might acclaim him, but in the land at large the monasteries were yet beloved.

The reckless, revoltingly brutal behavior of the emissaries sent to drive out the monks and nuns, who profaned the sacred vessels, turned the chasubles of the mass into horse-cloths, and beat over chalices and patens into silver scabbards for their daggers—this barbarity of the King's officers called out insurrections, first in Lincolnshire, then in Yorkshire, and at the same time came accounts of dangerous fermentations everywhere. The unhappy issue of these popular risings—notably of the so-called Pilgrimage of Grace—is known.

Some monks, as not unnatural, where the holiest objects were to be defended, had taken part in the insurrections, many under compulsion. This was a welcome opportunity for the King. Treason was for him a favorite tool. He had long desired to lay hands on the Greater Abbeys also, and what better way than to doom to death, on good evidence or bad, their abbots and their monks! If evidence was lacking, the refusal of the Oath of Supremacy led to the same end.

At first, while the monks and nuns were simply turned into the street, the heads of houses, whether Superiors, Guardians, Priors, or Abbots, were allowed a small income. The Government now held itself absolved from all further regard to them. The Duke of Norfolk was instructed, where the regulars of a suppressed convent were found outside of their assigned locality, to treat them as vagabonds and enemies of public order. The common punishment of a first offence was flogging; of a second, mutilation; of a third, the gallows. The attempt to take down the gibbeted bodies for Christian burial was itself a grievous offence. In 1537, under the Dukes of Norfolk, Suffolk, Cumberland, and the Earl of Sussex and others, a veritable reign of terror prevailed. The King was minded to slake his thirst for vengeance and "give examples."

Meanwhile the King, by means of certain very elastic phrases and a statute concerning the succession—such phrases as "estate

of inheritance," "persons convict, their heirs and successors"—had managed to introduce a complete revolution in English property rights. The confiscation to the Crown for high treason "and like offences" was extended so as to make *whole corporations* amenable as "successors" to such a forfeiture. Nothing more was needed to condemn Abbots and Superiors, as implicated in the revolts, to confiscate their estates and expel their monks and nuns. Thus in 1537 a whole series of the greater abbeys went to the ground. Some of these communities, it is true, were so foolish as to yield to the compulsion of making a "voluntary" cession of their estates to the King. And there were some lamentable apostasies, but these were exceptions. On the other hand, the history of this vandalism of overthrow records many glorious traits of noble faithfulness and love to their sacred vocation and to the Church on the part of very many monks and nuns.

In the autumn of 1537 the amount of confiscated monastic estates and possessions, movable and immovable, reached several millions (of marks ?); and in 1538 all the houses of the Mendicant Orders were already suppressed. The poor were most to be pitied, for the abundant doles of the great abbeys now ceased at once and forever. Up to 1540, besides the above-mentioned 376 monasteries, 202 more had been suppressed, great and small, among them 62 Benedictine houses. Thus from 8000 to 9000 regulars were left houseless; among them some 1800 Franciscans, Dominicans, and other Mendicants, and about 1700 Benedictines, 700 Cistercians, 1000 Regular Canons of the Augustinian and Premonstratensian order, etc., and some 1600 nuns of the different orders.

Among these houses of God thus fallen victims to the rapacity of a barbarous tyrant, a special interest attaches to three great Benedictine Abbeys—Glastonbury, Reading, and Colchester.

In the late autumn of 1539, Henry the Eighth's plans of destruction were almost all carried out; only some few houses were yet in possession of their legitimate owners and saw their religious life and their solemn worship still continuing for a little while within their walls. County after county had seen the King's commissioners doing their Vandal work, and monks and nuns in great number wandering about shelterless. "And com'st there not willing, then use I my force," was the word if any monastic superior held back; the indictment for High

Treason, with all its hideous consequences, was the result.

There still lifted its head as one of the great pyramids in the midst of a sandy waste the renowned national sanctuary, the ABBEY OF GLASTONBURY, which thus far had braved all the assaults of the Vandals, and as it had beheld the beginning of England's national history, seemed not unlikely to survive its close. For fourteen years it had been ruled by a man who, venerable by his learning and talent for administration, not less than for the sanctity of his life, enjoyed the chief consideration among the prelates of England. For this very reason an example was to be made of him and his abbey, in order to show to the kingdom of what an enormous power and authority the King had to dispose, and what all those had to expect who should still venture by their refractoriness to cross the plans of the monarch. It is true, the Abbot Richard Whiting—such was the name of the venerable old man—as the last successor of so great a number of holy superiors of the thousand-year-old house, had long been odious as a shaveling and spy of Rome; and because he maintained in his monastery an irreprehensible regularity, and also exercised a great influence far and wide around him, attempts had often been made to lay snares for him. But his circumspection had warned him of every danger, and rent the craftily disposed nets. At last it appeared to Cromwell and his lord high time to make a ridance of this champion of the Roman Catholic Church, together with his Abbey, as a bulwark of the papal authority. As there was not the slightest reason to hold him guilty of complicity with insurrection, and as all appeals to avarice, ambition, and fear were fruitless, the final means must be resorted to. The Oath of Supremacy was proposed to him, which he, with almost all the monasteries, but under another form, had taken in 1534. As he now refused to take it, and had also a little while before taken the precaution of placing the Church treasures in safety, he, with the Abbots of Reading and Colchester, besides two secular priests and two Benedictine monks (the latter of Glastonbury or Reading), was condemned to death, and suffered the martyr's death, being hanged, drawn, and quartered, November 15th, 1539.

To give more effect to the execution of the venerable Richard Whiting, he was returned from the Tower to his home, and suffered the revolting barbarities of his sentence on a hill in view of his Abbey of Glas-

tonbury, over whose portal his head was nailed, while the four quarters of his body were sent into the neighboring towns of Wells, Bath, Ilchester, and Bridgewater, "that all might know what fate awaits them that are not conformable to the King's Highness in all things."

The Abbey was plundered and a part of the buildings destroyed. So sank the august national sanctuary in Somerset, the pride of Britain since the fifth century—indeed, since the apostolic age. The venerable spot where, as sacred legend declared, St. Joseph of Arimathæa had struck his traveller's staff into the ground and had preached the Christian gospel, the burial-place of so many holy bishops and abbots, kings and dukes, the *Roma secunda*, as the English chroniclers named it—this fell as a sacrifice to the rapacity of a lustful tyrant.

Under Mary the Catholic an attempt was made to re-edify the ruins and to people again the desolated locality with sons of St. Benedict. John Feckenham, Benedictine monk of Evesham Abbey, had under Henry VIII. shared the fate of his brethren, and in Edward the Sixth's reign, on account of his invincible readiness to confess his faith and his unwearied and skilful labors in defence of it, he had been thrown into prison. Under the Catholic restoration of Queen Mary (1553-58), the famous London Abbey of Westminster was restored, and Feckenham was made Abbot. The scattered Benedictines of the realm, who had escaped the axe or famine or a murderous incarceration, as well as a numerous choir of young novices, flocked around the man of God. This gave room to hope that the darling wish of Catholic Albion might be fulfilled, and a colony sent out to repeople Glastonbury. A petition had already been presented to the Queen and the Lord Chancellor for the retransfer of the confiscated buildings and of the desolated church, inasmuch as already "there were various monks that were ready to renew their life there in peace according to the rule of St. Benedict, and to be helpful toward the salvation of the forsaken faithful." Unhappily, the impending turn in the history of England made the carrying out of this plan impossible; for Mary's early death, in 1558, crushed all the bright hopes attaching to the incipient Catholic restoration. Feckenham, in whose breast the lofty plan had ripened, was, under Queen Elizabeth, for yet long years to combat effectively for the Catholic faith by word and pen, until, after a tedious imprisonment, he, on August 5th, 1585, died the death of the Confessor.

THE REVISION OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

(A Paper read before a special meeting, Nov. 4, 1889, of the Presbytery of New York, and given by Dr. Schaff for republication in this Magazine.)

THE Westminster Confession of Faith is the clearest, strongest, and most logical statement of the Calvinistic system, but contains with it certain supralapsarian or hyper-Calvinistic features which are not necessarily connected with the system, but belong only to a school of theology in the Reformed Churches, and have always been disputed. These are the connected doctrines of reprobation, preterition, limited atonement, and the damnation of the whole non-Christian world, including (by inference) non-elect children dying in infancy.

The passages in which these doctrines are taught are as follows:

Chap. III., Sec. 3. "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death."

Sec. 4. "These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished."

Sec. 6. . . . "Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only."

Sec. 7. "The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice."

Chap. VI., Sec. 1. "Our first parents being seduced by the subtlety of Satan, sinned in eating the forbidden fruit. This their sin God was pleased, according to His wise and holy counsel, to permit, having purposed to order it to His own glory."

Chap. X., Sec. 3. "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word."

Sec. 4. "Others, not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come unto Christ, and therefore cannot be saved; much less can men, not professing the Christian religion, be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature and the law

* By "passing by," or preterition, is meant, of course, not a temporary, but a permanent omission, with everlasting consequences, in harmony with Chap. III., Sec. 3. In a restricted sense it would be true, as the salvation of the world proceeds gradually, beginning with the Jews, and passing to the Gentiles in a certain order of providential preparation and succession.

of that religion they do profess : and to assert and maintain that they may, is very pernicious, and to be detested."

The Confession also teaches that the Bishop of Rome is the Antichrist predicted by St. Paul, and that the Papists, *i.e.*, the Roman Catholics, are idolaters.

Chap. XXV., Sec. 6. "The Pope of Rome . . . is that Antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself, in the Church, against Christ and all that is called God."*

Chap. XXIV., Sec. 3, forbids marriage "with infidels, Papists, or other idolaters."

These doctrines have long since been abandoned in all the Reformed Churches on the Continent of Europe. They are now on trial in the Presbyterian Churches of the United States and Great Britain! A simultaneous movement has suddenly and independently broken out on both sides of the Atlantic, and is rapidly spreading among ministers and intelligent laymen, in favor of such a revision of the Westminster Confession as will relieve it of these offensive features, give greater prominence to the precious doctrine of God's love to all mankind, and express the living faith of the Church in the present age. I cannot but see in this movement the finger of God, who calls the Presbyterian Church to a higher, broader, and more liberal position in theory and practice. It is stronger than the reunion movement which, twenty years ago, melted the minds and hearts of the Old and New School into one communion, for greater and better work than they have ever done before.

Without entering into an argument,† I shall briefly present my objections to the doctrines of reprobation and preterition, and my reasons for a revision :

1. Supposing these doctrines were Scriptural, they are out of place in a public Confession of Faith, where they can do no possible good, but a great deal of harm. They ought to be left with other transcendent and ante-mundane mysteries to scientific and speculative theology, where they properly belong.

2. They are based upon a misunderstanding of a few obscure passages of the Bible, which nearly all modern exegetes of all schools explain differently and in harmony

with the clear and undisputed teaching of Christ and the Apostles. St. Paul undoubtedly teaches Divine sovereignty in the ninth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans—the strong fortress of supralapsarianism—but in the tenth chapter he teaches as clearly human responsibility, and in the eleventh chapter the future conversion of "the fulness of the Gentiles" and of "all Israel;" and he winds up the discussion with that wonderful sentence which contains the ultimate solution of this mysterious problem (xi. 32): "God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that He might have mercy upon all" [not "upon some," or "the elect only"]. Let us not stick in the darkness of the ninth, but go on to the glorious light of the eleventh chapter.

3. They are inconsistent with the whole spirit of the Gospel, which expressly and repeatedly teaches that God is love; that His love extends to all mankind; that He wills all men to be saved, and none to perish; that Christ is the Saviour of the race, and died not only for our sins, but for the sin of the whole world; that the Gospel is freely and sincerely offered to all men, and should be preached to every creature; that believers are saved by free grace, but the impenitent are lost by their own guilt. Compare John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 8, 16; 1 Tim. ii. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 9; 1 John ii. 2, etc.

God's saving love in Christ to all mankind is the central truth of Christianity, and the very marrow of the Gospel, and ought to be the heart and soul of every true Confession of Faith. The older Calvinism exalts God's love to the elect, but "passes by the rest of mankind." It did little or nothing for the conversion of the heathen till the great missionary revival which inspires the churches of our age.

4. Foreordination of some men to everlasting life, and of others to everlasting death, and preterition of all the non-elect (including the whole heathen world), are equally inconsistent with a proper conception of divine justice, and pervert it into an arbitrary partiality for a small circle of the elect, and an arbitrary neglect of the great mass of men. Justice is strictly impartial, and adapts rewards and punishments to man's merits and opportunities. It is only by an indefinite extension of the decree of election beyond the limits of the visible Church, that Calvinism can be relieved of the charge of narrowness, and be measurably reconciled with the idea of Divine justice and wisdom; but the Westminster Confession gives the benefit of such extension only to elect infants dying in infancy, and to in-

* 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4. Paul speaks here of "a mystery of lawlessness" (*avomia*) that was already at work in his own day (ver. 7). Whatever he meant by it, he could not mean the Pope, who did not yet exist, and who could hardly be charged with lawlessness, but rather with the very opposite—despotism. As to the term "Antichrist," it is only used by John, and he speaks of many Antichrists in his own day in Asia Minor, and characterizes them as false teachers who denied the incarnation (which the papacy never did).—1 John ii. 18, 22, iv. 3; 2 John vii.

† For a historical and doctrinal argument, the writer begs leave to refer to his article in the October number of "The Presbyterian Review."

capables, and denies it to all adults who are ignorant of Christianity, and profess any other religion, although they "frame their lives according to the light of nature."

5. These doctrines are not taught in the œcumenical creeds, nor in the older Reformed Confessions, with the exception of the Genevan Consensus (1552), the Lambeth Articles (1595), and the Irish Articles (1615), which documents never had much authority, and have long since gone out of use. Supralapsarianism represents only a theological school in the Reformed Church, and a very respectable one, but not the Church itself; it was, and should be tolerated, but it was not, and should not be, enjoined or imposed. It has, in my judgment, greater logical and speculative force than infralapsarianism; but it was always felt by the majority of Reformed divines, that by irresistible logic it makes God the author of sin and death, and that it would consistently lead to hopeless fatalism and pantheism, from which the supralapsarians themselves shrink back with horror. Hence nearly all the Confessions stop within the limits of infralapsarianism. Christian truth rises above the narrow limitations of logic and mathematics.

The Theses of Berne (1528), the First Confession of Basel (1532), the First Helvetic or Second Basel Confession (1536), the Geneva Catechism of Calvin (1545), the Gallican Confession (1559), the Belgic Confession (1561), the Heidelberg Catechism (1563), the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), the First and Second Scotch Confessions (1560 and 1580), the Thirty-nine Articles (1571), and even the Canons of the Synod of Dort (1619), and the Shorter Westminster Catechism (1647),* are silent on the decree of reprobation and preterition, and confine themselves to the positive, undisputed, and most comforting doctrine of the election of believers by free grace to everlasting life.

And in the Westminster Assembly itself, several of the ablest men, as Calamy, Seaman, Arrowsmith, and Gataker, were opposed to the majority on those knotty points, and advocated what is called conditional universalism, *i.e.*, a sincere divine intention and provision for the salvation of *all* men.

6. These doctrines are no longer believed by the majority of Presbyterians, nor preached by any Presbyterian minister as

far as I know.* They certainly could not be preached in any pulpit without emptying the pews. Presbyterian ministers, on the contrary, uniformly assume in their sermons the free and sincere offer of salvation to all men, and the sole responsibility of the sinner for rejecting the Gospel.

What cannot be preached in the Church and taught in the Sunday-school ought not to be put into a Confession of Faith, and imposed as a yoke upon the conscience of ministers and elders.

7. They obstruct the progress of the Presbyterian Church; they give aid and comfort to her enemies, and plausibility to their charges and misrepresentations; they have in times past driven away from the Confession a large party of English Presbyterians, New England Congregationalists, and the Cumberland Presbyterians, and they will in future prevent many promising students from entering the ministry, and intelligent laymen from serving as elders, so long as they are required to subscribe that document as "containing the system of doctrine taught in the Bible."†

It is true this formula of subscription, as generally understood by ministers and elders, is fortunately very liberal, and gives a large margin for dissent. But if the word "system" is used in the strict sense, it is not applicable to the Bible at all; for the Bible contains an infinite variety of truths, and is as far above the narrow limitations of any particular or denominational system of human theology, as nature is above every system of natural philosophy, and history above the compends of historians. It would be better to abolish subscription altogether, or so to alter the Confession as to make it unobjectionable, so that subscription to it may be an act of cheerful and whole-hearted assent.

A revision would not be complete without striking out the incidental and unnecessary denunciation of the Pope as Antichrist, and of two hundred millions of professed worshippers of Christ as idolaters. Such a denunciation can be easily explained from the polemical heat and political complications of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but calmly viewed from the present stage of historical knowledge, the charge

* Dr. Cuyler of Brooklyn, an experienced Presbyterian pastor, goes much further, and asserts that "ninety-nine hundredths" do not believe these features of the Westminster Confession. See "The New York Evangelist" for Oct. 31, 1889. When Dr. Schaaff read his more moderate statement in Presbytery, he asked the brethren present if any of them ever preached on the decree of reprobation and preterition, to contradict his assertion by rising; but no one rose. Silence gives consent.

† This is the subscription required of all church officers, ministers, ruling elders, and deacons, according to the *Form of Government*, chaps. xiii., xiv., and xv.

* But the Larger Catechism agrees with the Confession and teaches that "God . . . has passed by, and foreordained the rest (*i.e.*, the non-elect) to dishonor and wrath, to be for their sin inflicted, to the praise of the glory of His justice." Qu. xlii.

is untrue, unjust, uncharitable, and unchristian, as well as out of place in a religious creed; and no wise man or body of men would now venture to insert it.

Princeton theology—especially Dr. Archibald Alexander and Dr. Charles Hodge—did the greatest service to the Presbyterian Church by liberalizing the Calvinistic theology. Dr. Hodge boldly opposed the uncharitable anti-papery fanaticism of his day, and maintained against the decision of the Old School General Assembly of 1845, the Church character of the Roman Catholic communion, and the validity of her baptism. It was an equally great service that the same honored and beloved divine (with whom I had a delightful personal acquaintance) obliterated the Westminster distinction between elect and reprobate infants, and taught the salvation of *all* infants dying in infancy.* This was an immense progress in the right direction, and gives the whole theology a more sweet, evangelical, and catholic tone.

Now is the providential occasion to proceed a step further, and to remove from the Confession itself those stumbling-blocks and burdens which are becoming more and more unbearable to a large number of conscientious and liberal-minded men.

If the Church refuses to make the reasonable changes demanded by many of her most loyal sons, she will virtually reindorse and deliberately profess before the world some of the worst features of the theology of the seventeenth century, which taught a close union of Church and State, justified the burning of Servetus,† and declared religious toleration to be a pernicious error, and a device of the devil.‡

The Confession has already been revised, in 1788 and 1888, in several important articles, bearing upon Church and State, and forbidden marriages, and it is all the better and more acceptable for these changes. It is not more difficult to remove reprobation and preterition, the damnation of the heathen, and the denunciation of Papists

from the Confession, than it was a hundred years ago to reconstruct chap. xx. 4, xxiii. 3, xxxi. 1, 2, in favor of the doctrine of separation of Church and State, which the Westminster Assembly, itself the creature of the State and responsible to it, would have indignantly rejected as a dangerous heresy and downright political atheism. Why then not make these further changes and save the life and usefulness of a venerable document for other generations?

Or if this cannot be done without mutilating the document, then in humble reliance upon the Holy Ghost, who is ever guiding the Church, let us take the more radical step, with or through the Pan-Presbyterian Council, of preparing a brief, simple, and popular creed, which shall clearly and tersely express for laymen as well as ministers only the cardinal doctrines of faith and duty, leaving metaphysics and polemics to scientific theology; a creed that can be subscribed, taught, and preached *ex animo*, without any mental reservation, or any unnatural explanation; a creed that is full of the marrow of the gospel of God's infinite love in Christ for the salvation of the world.

Such a consensus-creed would be a bond of union between the different branches of the Reformed Church in Europe and America and in distant mission fields, and prepare the way for a wider union with other Evangelical Churches. It ought not to contradict the Westminster Confession, but retain its best features, and supplement it by those truths of the Scriptures which are now made most vital and important in the mind of the Church, and best calculated to promote its mission at home and abroad.

The Congregationalists in America made a new creed of Twelve Articles in 1883,* and the English Presbyterians made one of Twenty-four Articles in 1888;† both are thoroughly evangelical, and skillfully avoid all the knotty and disputed points of the scholastic Calvinism of a by-gone age. The Presbyterian Church of the United States, with or without the co-operation of the Pan-Presbyterian Council, has sufficient wisdom, learning, and piety to produce a creed to suit her wants.

In conclusion: I am in favor of both a revision of the Westminster Confession by the General Assembly, and an œcumenical Reformed Consensus to be prepared by the Pan-Presbyterian Council. If we cannot have both, let us at least have one of the two, and I shall be satisfied with either.

* Dr. Shedd also, while he still teaches *reprobation* and *preterition* as a necessary part of Calvinistic theology, agrees with Princeton, whether logically or illogically, in extending election to *all* infants dying in infancy, and to some adults among the heathen. A very important concession.

† It is well known that Calvin himself wrote a special defence of the execution of the unfortunate Spaniard; and he can only be justified for his share in the tragedy on the ground that he regarded it his solemn duty to God and the Church to act as he did.

‡ This was the view even of the venerable and liberal Richard Baxter, and of the New England Puritans in the days of expelling Baptists, hanging Quakers, and burning witches. If American Protestants abhor anything, it is the principle and practice of religious persecution; and yet it is inseparable from a strict construction of the union of Church and State such as was maintained by the Westminster Assembly in common with all State churches or churches established by law.

* Printed in Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom," Vol. III., p. 910 seq., Fourth Edition, 1884.

† Published in "The N. Y. Evangelist" for Oct. 31, 1889.

Something must and will be done to bring the Presbyterian Standards into harmony with the living Church of to-day, and to make them a potent factor for the great work of the reunion of Christendom.

STAMPING OUT PROTESTANTISM IN RUSSIA.*

BY CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D.

From *The Nineteenth Century*, London, December, 1889.

THE efforts put forth since the accession of Nicholas to the throne of Russia to Russify the Baltic Provinces are daily assuming more and more the character not only of a political, but also of a religious persecution.

These provinces have been in the possession of Russia for scarcely more than a century. Christianity was introduced there from Western Europe in 1172. At the Reformation era the reformed faith won the day after a short but decisive struggle, and Lutheranism has been ever since the common creed of the peoples of the provinces, although composed of various races and nationalities.

Esthonia and Livonia were ceded to Russia in consequence of the victories of Peter the Great, but by the peace of Nystädt the Lutheran Church was confirmed in all its privileges as the Established Church of those provinces. Kurland obtained similar terms from the Empress Catherine, when that province, in 1795, voluntarily submitted to her sway.

In defiance of those solemn covenants the Emperor Nicholas promulgated a new code of ecclesiastical law in 1832, whereby the Greek Church formally became the Estab-

lished Church, and the provisions of the Russian penal code became applicable to the provinces. But inasmuch as it was impossible to put such provisions in force in a country where all, both nobles and peasants, were, almost without exception, Protestants, it was fondly hoped that the new law would become practically a *brutum fulmen*, and that no real harm would be done to the Protestant Church.

When a Greek bishopric was established in Riga in 1837 the authorities took due care to explain, that by the erection of the see nothing was intended contrary to the interests of the Protestant religion. The worthlessness of Russian imperial promises was, however, soon only too manifest. A series of bad harvests in 1839, 1840, and 1841 created great distress among the peasantry, and a state of famine prevailed in the Baltic Provinces in 1844 and 1845. Russian agents traversed the country in order to stir up the peasantry against the landowners, who were mostly of German origin. Those agents represented to the peasants that if they would outwardly conform to the Russian Church they would be placed in a position independent of the proprietors. The peasants were assured that if they only placed their names on the Greek registers they would be allowed freely to retain their churches, sermons, sacraments, and Bibles, while they would be freed from the necessity of paying tithes to the German pastors. Greater religious liberty was promised to them than had ever been enjoyed in the bosom of the Lutheran Church. Greek priests were at the same time ostentatiously permitted by Bishop Philaret to read from the pulpits Protestant sermons, and Greek churches were even granted occasionally for Moravian services. But all this liberty was but a bait to induce the ignorant peasants to place their names on the Greek registers.* By the law of Russia no one who becomes a member of the Greek Church is permitted, on any pretext whatever, to secede from her communion.

The Russian propagandists had recourse

* Die Bedrückung der Deutschen und die Entrechtung der protestantischen Kirche in den Ostsee-Provinzen. Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1888.—*Russisch-baltische Blätter*, Heft i.-iv, Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1888-88.—*Die Vergewaltigung der russischen Ostsee-Provinzen*. Appell an das Ehrgefühl des Protestantismus von einem Balten. Berlin: A. Deubner, 1888.—*Die baltische Provinzen Russlands*. Politische und culturgeschichtliche Ansätze. Von Julius Eckhart. 2 Aufl. Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1869.—*Livländische Beiträge*, herausgegeben von W. von Bock. Band I, (2 parte), 1867-68; Band II, (7 parte), 1868-69; Neue Folge, Band I, Heft i.-v., with supplement, 1869-71. Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot.—*Geschichtsblätter aus der Lutherischen Kirche Livlands vom Jahre 1845 an*. Von Dr. G. C. Adolf von Harless. 2 Aufl. Leipzig, 1869.—*Die luth.-nationalen Bewegung und die kurländische Geistlichkeit*. Eine unparteiische Stimme aus den Ostsee-Provinzen. Leipzig: Böhme, 1886.—*Verfassungsgeschichte der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche in Russland*. Von Dr. Hermann Dalton. Gotha: Perthes, 1887.—*Im Banne Moskaus*. Die evangelisch-lutherische Kirche in den russischen Ostsee-Provinzen. Von Dr. K. H. Neubert. Barmen: Klein, 1888.—*Russland am Scheidewege*. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Slavophilenthums und zur Beurtheilung seiner Politik. Berlin: Wilhelm, 1888.—*Deutsch-protestantische Kämpfe in den baltischen Provinzen Russlands*. Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1888.—*Zur Gewissensfreiheit in Russland*. Offenes Sendschreiben an den Oberprokurator des russischen Synods, Herrn Wirklichen Geheimrat K. Pobedonozzeff von Hermann Dalton. 7ter Abdruck. Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1889.

* These statements can be abundantly proved by a reference to the mass of depositions on the subject sworn before the courts of the provinces, which are given in the work of von Harless and in the larger book of von Bock, entitled *Livländische Beiträge*, published from 1867 to 1871. The "Leaves from the Diary of a Russian Official in Riga, 1846" (given in full in chapter iv. of the *Deutsch protestantische Kämpfe in den baltischen Provinzen*) recounts a number of cases in which the Lutheran clergy were harassed by the police. Several pastors were deprived of their benefices and punished in various ways. Evangelical publications were suppressed and confiscated. Rewards were liberally bestowed on all officials who exhibited zeal in the work of "conversion." Greek churches were, in several cases, erected on farms in spite of the protests of the landowners. Protestants were compelled to uncover their heads and pay honour to Greek processions, and in other ways molested in their conscientious opposition to the inroads of the Greek Church.

to even worse methods. Memorials to the Czar, drawn up in Russian, and purporting to be memorials for an extension of civil rights, were extensively signed by the peasants who were wholly ignorant of that language. The memorials ultimately proved to be petitions for enrolment as members of the Greek Church. The memorialists were informed in due course by the bishop that the Czar had graciously acceded to their request, and that they had been duly enrolled as Greek Catholics. All protests were in vain. Many were forcibly baptized and anointed. The names of others were in many cases inserted on the church registers as "anointed" and "confirmed," although they had not actually undergone those rites. Russian law assigns a certain period for due consideration before converts are received into the Greek Church. But the provision was set at nought, and no legal permission has ever since been accorded to those who were then so foully betrayed for reinstating themselves in their proper position as members of the Lutheran Church.

No doubt large numbers were, in the period referred to, induced, by promises of secular advantages, to join the Greek Church. But many cases of cruel wrong were done in entire violation of the rights of conscience. The enrolment of a father in a state of intoxication legally transferred in some cases his wife, and in all cases his children under age, to the registers of the Greek communion.

It is not surprising that such a propaganda should have had considerable success. The success would not, however, have proved so considerable had it not been for the estrangement which existed between the peasantry and the nobles. Though the peasants and nobles were united in a common adherence to the Protestant faith, the German nobles were accustomed to look down upon the people whom their forefathers had conquered as inferior races fit only for serfdom, while the conquered races in return regarded the nobles as their oppressors. The clergy, with noble exceptions, were too much imbued with the feelings of the nationality from whence they had sprung, and agrarian disputes embittered the relations between the peasants and the landed proprietors.

The education of the peasantry had been too generally neglected in the days of quiet; although extensive efforts were set on foot in 1830 and in 1846 to improve the education and to enlarge the privileges of the peasant population. It would have been easy in the previous decades to have thoroughly Germanised the original races had

that task then been undertaken. But the opportunity was let slip, and the Russian Government now sought to Russify the peasantry. It is undeniable, too, that its efforts were attended with a certain amount of success.

But the peasantry awoke at last to a comprehension of the real position of affairs. They discovered that they had been duped, and that the civil and religious liberty promised to them was a delusion. They strove in vain to shake off their connection with the Greek Church. They flocked in troops back to their old churches, and implored the Lutheran pastors to reinstate their names again on the Protestant registers. But, willing as the pastors were to readmit "backsliders" to their communion, the laws of the Russian Empire forbade such a return. Lutherans are, in Russia, permitted freely to pass over to the ranks of "the Orthodox," but the Russian Church permits no "apostates" from her communion. The "character" she imparts by the "anointing oil" is considered to be as "indelible" as "holy orders." Unbelievers may remain even as "atheists" "within" the Russian Church, but no one is permitted to "go forth" from her fold. The statement of Prince Tscherkasky at the Slavonic Congress in Moscow in 1869 cannot be forgotten: "I prefer a thousand times rather an orthodox Greek atheist than a believing Roman Catholic." The statement affords the key to understand Russian policy.

Petitions upon petitions from the injured peasantry now poured in upon the authorities. Those petitions described the artifices by which the poor peasants had been beguiled. The "exceeding bitter cry" which arose from the cottage to the noble's hall, and echoed from the hall to the throne, was too loud to be wholly disregarded. Alexander the Second was constrained to make inquiry into the matter, and General Count Bobrinski was commissioned, in 1863, to visit the Baltic Provinces, and to report on the subject to the Emperor.

Count Bobrinski's official report, dated April 18, 1864, was a terrible justification of the grievances complained of. According to that report, out of the whole number of 140,000 persons, entered upon the registers of the Greek Church as converts, scarcely one-tenth really belonged to that communion. All the rest in heart and soul still continued to be members of the Lutheran Church. The report closed with the words:—

Your Majesty, it has been painful to me, as Orthodox and as a Russian, to witness with my own eyes

the degradation of the Russian Orthodoxy through the public exposure of this official fraud. It is not the earnest words of these unhappy families, who turn themselves to your Majesty with the humble but impassioned prayer to grant them the right to confess the religion which is in accordance with the conviction of their own conscience, not those open-hearted and touching expressions of their feelings, which have made so painful an impression on me, as this fact in particular—that the violence done to conscience, and the official fraud, which is known to all, should be indissolubly connected with the thought of Russia and Orthodoxy.

The report of Count Bobrinski brought a little relief to the harassed provinces. The “converts” were not, indeed, permitted openly to return to the Church of their forefathers. But the legal proceedings against most of them were tacitly dropped for a season. Bishop Philaret was translated to another diocese, and his successor, who was created Archbishop of Riga, was not at first disposed to carry matters with so high a hand. The new archbishop, however, was not willing to grant religious liberty to the oppressed; he merely sought to postpone the matter. He admitted that many names had been unfairly placed upon the registers of his church. But even in such cases he refused to concede liberty of conscience, lest the conclusion should be drawn that secession was, under any circumstances, permitted from the Greek communion.*

The persecution of the Lutherans in the Baltic Provinces was for many years not generally known to their co-religionists in the more favoured countries of Europe. Christians in England, under the guidance of the Evangelical Alliance (founded in 1846), had their attention directed to various religious persecutions in Florence and other parts of Italy, in Spain, in Germany, and in Turkey, long before the cry of oppression was heeded which arose from the Baltic Provinces. In 1870 the Evangelical Alliance took up at last the case of the Baltic Provinces, and an international deputation was sent to the Emperor of Russia. A memorial to the Emperor was with difficulty presented through the medium of Prince Gortschakoff, and the fair words spoken by the Prince on that occasion gave some reason to hope that an increased modicum of religious liberty would be granted to the sorely harassed Lutherans of those provinces.

With the presentation, however, of the memorial, and the publication of an account

of the “gracious” manner in which it had been received, all efforts of the Alliance in that direction came to an end. No sufficient means were taken to discover the actual results brought about by the “memorial” in the provinces themselves. The “intelligence” department of the Evangelical Alliance has never been really “up to the mark,” and Russian policy was not easily turned aside from its fixed purpose of the Russification of the provinces.

It reads almost as a satire on the impotent efforts of the Evangelical Alliance to know now that the very year in which Prince Gortschakoff gave such a “gracious” reply, a society was actually founded in Russia, under Imperial patronage, for the express purpose of converting the Lutherans to the Orthodox faith. Had that society sought to accomplish its purpose by a use of all the arts of persuasion and controversy, no one would have a right to complain. But the objects of the society were mainly political; it carried on its propaganda by means of agencies similar to those already described, while it was backed by the power of the Russian Empire. Yet, active as were its operations, nothing was heard of its doings by the English Evangelical Alliance for nearly fifteen years!

With the accession of Alexander the Third a new chapter of religious persecution has been opened. The sad circumstances under which the present monarch commenced his reign were not such as to render him favourably disposed to any movements in the direction of liberty. And owing to the severity of the present persecution the days of Alexander the Second are now looked back upon as a time of comparative peace.

In the Baltic Provinces Lutheran pastors, however anxious they may be to confine their ministrations to persons of their own communion, are often placed under the greatest difficulties. No inconsiderable number of the so-called “converts” have naturally persisted in attendance at Lutheran services. Many, too, of those who, through fear, for a time conformed to the Greek Church, have been driven back by their consciences into the Protestant churches. Many also contrived to conceal a “conversion” of which they were ashamed, and in no few cases managed to retain their names upon the Protestant registers. Consequently not only were those earnest pastors, who felt constrained to “obey God rather than man,” brought into constant collision with the Russian ecclesiastical authorities, but many others who might have been disposed to temporise have also fallen

* Special negotiations were carried on with Archbishop Platon on behalf of ninety-eight persons who claimed their liberty as having been falsely enrolled. Out of that small number fifty-six persons were, in opposition to their solemn protests, declared by him to be members of the Greek Church, and the police authorities were directed to compel the attendance of those persons at the Greek services.

under the condemnation of the Russian penal code. The best course, and possibly the safest in the end, would have been boldly to defy the law and to brave persecution. But it is not surprising that persons situated in such trying circumstances should have in many cases attempted to elude the law by other less honourable contrivances.

But as in the fable, the wolf, in order to justify his intended slaughter, complained loudly of the misdeeds of the lamb, so there have not been lacking writers who in the present crisis have sought to paint Russia in the character of a generous benefactor, anxious only to deliver the peasantry of the provinces from the power of a rapacious nobility. But if the full history of the facts were known, the fullest sympathy of all Englishmen would be accorded to the suffering Protestants of the Baltic Provinces.

The intolerant and persecuting spirit which now characterises Russian rule in these provinces may be seen by the statement of a few facts.

In March, 1886, the Minister of the Interior issued an order to the police to prevent persons not belonging to the Greek Church from using chaplets of flowers at funerals. Those who are acquainted with Continental habits know that the custom of depositing garlands on the coffin and of throwing flowers into the grave is more common than in our country. Much indignation has been created by such a wanton interference with a harmless custom; and one can scarcely be surprised at the anger created among the bystanders when the police have on several occasions required the coffins to be taken up from the grave in order to despoil them of the last fond tokens of love and respect. Even when committing the remains of their friends to the tomb, Protestants must be taught to feel their inferiority to members of the Orthodox Church! And this in countries where less than twenty years ago Protestantism was supreme, and where even still Protestant pastors are recognised by the law!

A beginning has already been made with the appropriation of churches erected for Protestant worship for the purposes of the Greek Church. When a petition was sent to St. Petersburg complaining of such injustice, the first person who headed the list of petitioners was immured for some time in the casemates of the Imperial Palace at St. Petersburg. No Lutheran churches are in future to be built, unless permission is specially granted by the Orthodox clergy; while the Greek clergy have obtained the right to allocate any sites they may choose

for the erection of Greek churches and schools, without the consent of the land-owners.

The visit of Bishop Donat to Palzmar in June 1885 was attended with some remarkable circumstances. The Bishop was met by a large crowd of "converts," who implored him to permit them openly to profess the Protestant religion which they held, and to allow their names to be struck off the Greek registers, inasmuch as in heart and soul they were in reality Lutherans. They explained to the bishop that their names had been placed on the registers of the Greek Church by the fault of their parents, or through their own ignorance. The bishop refused to listen to their entreaties, and informed them that if they persisted in harassing him by such requests, he would have their clergyman, Pastor Brandt, removed from office, and thus the parish would be deprived altogether of a Protestant pastor. The peasants boldly replied that they could read the Word of God for themselves, and, if their pastor were removed, they would form themselves into a Lutheran society, and select some man of their own number acquainted with the Bible to preach to them and to administer the Lord's Supper.

Among the petitioners on that occasion was a Lettish peasant woman, Anna Kursemneeks by name, thirty-two years old, who had originally been baptized in the Lutheran Church. The name of Anna and that of her sister had been placed upon the Greek registers in consequence of her father having been enrolled and "confirmed" as a Greek Catholic during the excitement of the former years. Anna implored the bishop with tears to be permitted to remain in the Church of her forefathers. Instead of replying to her request, the bishop presented her with the picture of a saint, and directed her to pray to the Virgin Mary. She refused the picture, stating that she believed Christ to be the only mediator between God and man. Several priests who were with the bishop urged her to accept the holy picture, for the bishop would then give her absolution. She replied that the bishop had no power to forgive sins, for he was but man and not God, and stated that the Lutheran pastor only ventured to declare that pardon came from God. Some Greek bystanders then called her a great sinner. She replied that she knew that very well, but that Christ pardoned sinners and not Pharisees. She was then threatened with the Czar's displeasure, but nobly answered that the Emperor might take away

her life, but that he could not rob her of her faith.

On the 26th of July, 1885, an Imperial ukase was issued threatening severe measures against all "converts" who dared to return to Lutheranism. A petition was at once sent in to the Czar, signed by Anna Kursemneeks and her sister and two men of Palzmar, named Leitis and Ohsol. The petition is given in full in the *Russisch-baltische Blätter*, Heft III., and in Dr. Neubert's interesting little work. Its language might well have touched the heart of the mighty Czar; the Emperor, in all probability, never saw it. But the answer came in the shape of police domiciliary visits. Pastor Brandt and his schoolmaster Abel, who were suspected of having a hand in the affair, were thrown into the criminal prison of Riga, and Anna Kursemneeks had to undergo a rigorous examination, followed by a short imprisonment.

When interrogated and asked how she dared to send such a petition to the Czar, the woman replied that she was wont to ask God daily for all that she needed, and that therefore she considered she might ask His representative on earth for what he could grant her. When it was objected to her that she subscribed herself as a "most obedient subject," and yet had ventured to disobey the Czar by abandoning the Greek Church, she replied, "I am prepared to give up to the Czar all he demands—even my life; but my heart and my faith I cannot yield to him, for these I must give to God only."

In March 1886 sentence was passed on Pastor Brandt. He was deprived of his pastorate and banished to Smolensk. There he was placed under police surveillance, was permitted to work for 2½d. a day, but not allowed to preach or teach. His heroic wife soon joined him in his punishment. The case, after some time, aroused much sympathy in St. Petersburg, and he has recently been permitted to accept a small pastorate in the interior. Jacob Abel, the schoolmaster, was deposed from office, and declared "a politically untrustworthy person," and incapable of holding any office as teacher, or even as sexton. The only offence laid to his charge has been that of opposing the propaganda of the Greek Church.

Sixty-five pastors have been already prosecuted before the courts of Livonia on the charges (1) of having administered the Lord's Supper to persons who had been enrolled on the Greek registers, and (2) of having performed marriages between Lutherans and members of the Greek Church.

All persons whose names are, however wrongly, on the Greek registers are legally regarded as Greek Catholics. In most of these cases the courts of the province returned a verdict of "not proven." The Imperial prosecutor appealed to the Supreme Court of Russia, that is, the Senate in St. Petersburg. The Senate have already condemned Pastor Christoph, of St. Johannis, in Esthonia, to a year's banishment to Astrachan, and Pastor Hoerschelmann, of Hagers, in Esthonia, to banishment to Eastern Siberia, though the latter has been recommended by the Senate to the Imperial clemency.

The Senate of St. Petersburg has lately expressed its opinion that the Church law in the provinces is too weak to meet the exigencies of the present situation. In a ukase of January 28, 1888, issued in the case of Pastor Emil Wegener, of Ecks, and other accused pastors of Livonia, the Senate has asked the Imperial Government for further powers in order to secure the condemnation of the offending pastors. By the law of 1832 all offences committed by the clergy must first be brought before the Church courts or consistories. Those courts, as well as the ordinary courts of the provinces, have proved too favourably disposed to the accused pastors. Hence it has been decided to dissolve all the consistories throughout the Baltic Provinces, and a beginning is to be made with the consistories of Riga, Reval, and Arensburg. The criminal courts, too, have also been partially reconstructed; and in all cases in which clerical offences are to be tried it has been decided that the officials, from the judge down to the lowest officer, must be members of the Orthodox Church.

The Russian Governor of Livonia, Michael Sinowjeff, in an official letter to Bishop Donat, dated February, 1887, states that in future all cases of "apostasy" from the Orthodox Church will be severely punished. "Converts" who attend the instructions of a Lutheran pastor are to be ineligible for any post under Government. They are to be liable to imprisonment; their children may be taken away from them and handed over to members of the Orthodox communion to be brought up as Greek Catholics. Such guardians will also be liable to severe punishment if they fail to impart the necessary training in the Greek faith to all children committed to their care. Heavier punishments are to be meted out to "converts" who venture to get married in Lutheran churches. All such marriages are declared to be illegal; the offspring of such

marriages are to be regarded as illegitimate, and incapable of inheriting the property of their parents. Imprisonment, from eight to ten months, is to be the penalty of any such persons as venture to train up their children in the Lutheran faith.

Such is "civil and religious liberty" in the Baltic Provinces of Russia! It is no wonder that the International Committee of the Evangelical Alliance, at its meeting at Geneva, determined to memorialise the Emperor of Russia on the subject; and a memorial signed by the presidents and secretaries of its various branches was duly forwarded to his Majesty in August, 1887.

In January, 1888, a remarkable answer was received to this communication. The answer was addressed to M. Edward Naville, the eminent Egyptologist, President of the Swiss Central Committee of the Evangelical Alliance. The answer was not sent from the Cabinet of the Czar, but was signed by Konstantin Pobedonoszeff, chief Procurator of the Holy Synod of the Russian Church. This remarkable man was formerly tutor to the present Emperor. He is the author of a work in several volumes on Russian jurisprudence, and the translator into Russian of Thomas à Kempis's *Imitation of Christ*. His piety was strikingly displayed in his earnest *Appeal to the Russian Youth*, written on the occasion of the murder of the Emperor Alexander the Second. But alas! M. Pobedonoszeff has, by his actions, and by his letters on the question of the Baltic Provinces, proved himself to be a bigoted Greek Catholic, and utterly unable to comprehend the very first principles of religious liberty. His letter to M. Naville is an impeachment of the Baltic pastors and of the German nobility, in which facts and fictions are curiously blended together. He accuses the Lutheran clergy of bigotry towards the Greek communion, because they are opposed to the doctrines of that Church. But he forgets "the beam that is in his own eye." He denies that freedom of conscience is interfered with in Russia, in which empire he asserts that all creeds are perfectly free, "*if only they abstain from proselytising.*" M. Pobedonoszeff cannot comprehend the fundamental truth, that what he calls "freedom" falls infinitely short of what is really meant by the term, and that as long as the Russian law attempts forcibly to restrain men within the pale of the Russian Church, or to prevent persons who have passed over from any cause to the Greek Church returning to the Church from whence they originally seceded, there is no such thing as real religious liberty in the Russian Empire.

Dr. Hermann Dalton, late pastor at St. Petersburg, has issued a reply to M. Pobedonoszeff. He comments on the unfairness with which the press of the provinces has been muzzled, while gross libels are published upon the Protestant clergy and nobility of those lands. M. Pobedonoszeff insinuated that the clergy were seeking to stir up their people against Russia. Dr. Dalton challenges him to produce one single instance of their disloyalty. One paragraph tending in that direction, cited by the Russian official, Dr. Dalton points out never appeared in the sermon incriminated, but was quoted from a review of that sermon by the Russian journalist Katkoff. The Protestants of the Baltic Provinces have freely shed their blood for Russia on many a hard-fought battle-field. In speaking of the schools of the provinces, Dr. Dalton shows from official statistics how far they surpass all those of the other parts of the Russian Empire. He quotes even Katkoff in their favour, who wrote as follows: "Russia will, no doubt, give its utmost support to the German customs and German culture in those lands. God preserves us from the vandalism of destroying a school system based upon the foundation common to all civilised nations! God forbid that we should bring down the gymnasia of the provinces to the sad level of our educational establishments! May the instruction both in the gymnasia and in the university continue in the German language. A protest against that arrangement would, indeed, proceed on our side from veritably false national pride, from which, thank God, we are free."

Dr. Dalton does not enter into many details of the persecution. He quotes the anathemas against Protestantism uttered by Archbishop Platon; he exposes the manner in which M. Pobedonoszeff seeks to ignore the official report of Count Bobrinski. He refers to the suppression of the Protestant missionary work carried on in the Caucasus and elsewhere, which has not been taken up by the Russian Church. He shows from M. Pobedonoszeff's own report in 1884, not only that converts have fallen back into Mohammedanism, but that numbers of Russian Christians have there apostatised from Christianity without any let or hindrance being placed in their way. He exposes severely the fact, that while Mohammedan works against Christianity, and even in favour of a "Holy War" against Christians, are permitted by Russian censorship to be printed in the University Press at Kasan, Protestant books are suppressed in the Baltic Provinces. Step by step he goes through the letter of

the Russian advocate of persecution, and closes a letter of over ninety octavo pages by giving sad instances in which the suppression of the rights of conscience has driven some to despair and infidelity.

A translation of the letter of M. Pobedonoszeff appeared in the *Times* of May 26, 1888. It was also inserted in *Evangelical Christendom* of June, 1888. Little notice, however, has been called to that reply by the British Evangelical Alliance. That society has found it, no doubt, far easier to attend to other work than to attempt to call attention to the case of their suffering brethren in the Baltic Provinces. Meanwhile the English Church, in the person of the Archbishop of Canterbury, has recently sent kind and flattering messages of love to the persecuting Church of Russia, while it has not uttered a syllable of remonstrance with respect to the cruel deeds done to a sister Protestant communion. Possibly the Archbishop of Canterbury has no acquaintance with the facts mentioned in our article. But it is one of the first duties of a society like the Evangelical Alliance to see that the English public is duly informed from time to time on all such matters. It may be able to do no more, but it ought to make strenuous efforts at least to perform this duty.

The Russian Church has often been unfairly accused of being opposed to the circulation of the Holy Scriptures. But the Russian Church has in this particular of late nobly done her duty. Information of a certain kind travels slowly, even in our days, and often fails to find an attentive public. But the fact referred to is now becoming more generally known, and many people have come to the conclusion that there is "religious liberty" in Russia, and that the struggle in the Baltic Provinces is purely, or mainly, political. Religious liberty, however, in the proper sense of the word, is utterly unknown in Russia. No such liberty can exist where the right of spreading one's religious convictions is denied, and where no secession is permitted from an established Church. Russia is engaged in an attempt to "stamp out" Protestantism in the Baltic Provinces.

Though little has appeared in the columns of the daily press, the Baltic Provinces are wrapped in the flames of a ruthless persecution. The persecution may have a political object in view, but it is no less religious. We have not told the whole, or the half, of the story. Powerful efforts are put forth to destroy the Protestant schools. Those schools, built and maintained at the cost of

the German communities, are now forced to adopt the Russian language as the medium of instruction. Religious instruction in the Protestant faith is interfered with. The pastors are not permitted to teach doctrines opposed to the teaching of the Greek Church. No warning voice is to be lifted against the practices of that Church, though those practices are in many particulars opposed to the tenets of all the Protestant communions, the Church of England included. We cannot enter into details on these heads. The gymnasia, once the pride of the provinces, are more than threatened. The University of Dorpat is to be completely Russified. Personal political liberty is at an end, as well as religious liberty. Englishmen may not be able to afford much assistance to the sufferers, but at least they ought to understand the true state of the case. It is, however, difficult to get at the history of facts. It is well known in Sweden, that a young man who attended the conference of the Young Men's Christian Association held last year in Stockholm, and spoke about the sufferings of his co-religionists in the Baltic Provinces, was arrested on his return home, and transported to Siberia. Such cases are not permitted to be mentioned in the public press. The newspapers of the provinces are under strict supervision: the courts do their work quietly; private correspondence, as we know from practical experience, is being strictly watched by the police, and many avenues of information once open are now closed. The Russian police and officials are vigorously at work to destroy the highest civilisation found in the Russian Empire, and to bury it, and the Protestantism which gave it birth, in one common grave.

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the above was written the *Times* of November 16 has published the following important intelligence:—

"The Czar has granted three months of unsolicited leave of absence to M. Pobedonoszeff, the Procurator-General of the Holy Russian Synod."

The *Times'* correspondent states further that the Czar during his recent stay at Copenhagen received Dr. Dalton's pamphlet, and learned therefrom something of the religious oppression in the Baltic Provinces. On his return to Russia the Emperor wrote an autograph letter to M. Pobedonoszeff, giving him three months' leave, and directing him to make use of the time in writing "a full and convincing answer" to Dr. Dalton's work. In vain has the Procurator-General sought for a private audience with his Majesty. The audience has been refused until the justificatory memoir shall have been handed in. These facts give much reason to hope for the dawn of better things, even in the oppressed Baltic Provinces.

THE DELUGE—BIBLICAL AND GEOLOGICAL.

BY PRINCIPAL SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON, LL. D.

From The Contemporary Review, London, December, 1889.

To those whose memories can go back for half a century, more or less, the story of the deluge, old though it is, has passed through a variety of phases like the changes of a kaleidoscope, and which may afford an instructive illustration of the modifications of belief in other and some of them to us more important matters, whether of history or of religion, which have presented themselves in like varied aspects and may be variously viewed in the future.

As children we listened with awe and wonder to the story of the wicked antediluvians, and of their terrible fate and the salvation of righteous Noah, and received a deep and abiding impression of the enormity of moral evil and of the just retribution of the Great Ruler of the Universe. A little later, though the idea that all the fossil remains imbedded in the rocks are memorials of the deluge had passed away from the minds of the better informed, we read with interest the wonderful revelations of the bone-caves described by Buckland, and felt that the antediluvian age had become a scientific reality. But later still all this seemed to pass away like a dream. Under the guidance of Lyell we learned that even the caves and gravels must be of greater age than the historical deluge, and that the remains of men and animals contained in them must have belonged to far-off æons, antedating perhaps even the biblical creation of man; while the historical deluge, if it ever occurred, must have been an affair so small and local that it had left no traces on the rocks of the earth. At the same time biblical critics were busy with the narrative itself, showing that it could be decomposed into different documents, that it bore traces of a very recent origin, that it was unhistorical, and to be relegated to the same category with the fairy tales of our infancy. Again, however, the kaleidoscope turns, and the later researches of geology into the physical and human history of the more recent deposits of the earth's crust, the discoveries of ancient Assyrian or Chaldean records of the deluge, and the comparison of these with the ancient history of other nations, rehabilitate the old story; and as we study the new facts respecting the so-called palæolithic and neolithic men, the clay tablets recovered from the libraries of Nineveh by George Smith, the calculations of Prestwich and

others respecting the recency of the glacial period, and the historical gatherings of Lenormant, we find ourselves drifting back to the faith of our childhood, or may congratulate ourselves on having adhered to it all along, even when the current of opinion tended strongly to turn us away. In illustration of the present aspects of the question I make two extracts, one from Lenormant's "Beginnings of History," another from a recent work of my own:

"We are [says Lenormant] in a position to affirm that the account of the deluge is an universal tradition in all branches of the human family, with the sole exception of the black race. And a tradition everywhere so exact and so concordant cannot possibly be referred to an imaginary myth. No religious or cosmogonic myth possesses this character of universality. It must necessarily be the reminiscence of an actual and terrible event, which made so powerful an impression upon the imaginations of the first parents of our species that their descendants could never forget it. This cataclysm took place near the primitive cradle of mankind, and previous to the separation of the families from whom the principal races were to descend, for it would be altogether contrary to probability and to the laws of sound criticism to admit that local phenomena exactly similar in character could have been reproduced at so many different points on the globe as would enable one to explain these universal traditions, or that these traditions should always have assumed an identical form, combined with circumstances which need not necessarily have suggested themselves to the mind in such a connection."*

On the geological side, the following may be accepted as a summary of facts:†

"If the earliest men were those of the river gravels and caves, men of the Mammoth age or of the palæolithic or palæocosmic period, we can form some definite ideas as to their possible antiquity. They colonized the continents immediately after the elevation of the land from the great subsidence which closed the pleistocene or glacial period, or in what has been called the 'continental' period of the post-glacial age, because the new lands then raised out of the sea exceeded in extent those which we now have. We have some measures of the date of this great continental elevation. Many years ago, Sir Charles Lyell used the recession of the Falls of Niagara as a chronometer, estimating their cutting power as equal to one foot per annum. He calculated the beginning of the process, which dates from the post-glacial elevation, to be about thirty thousand years ago. More recent surveys have shown that the rate is three times as great as that estimated by Lyell, and also that a considerable part of the gorge was merely cleaned out by the river since the pleistocene age. In this way the age of the Niagara gorge becomes reduced to perhaps seven or eight thousand years. Other indications of similar bearing are found both in Europe and America, and lead to the belief that it is physically impossible that man could have colonized the northern hemisphere at an earlier date. These facts render necessary an entire revision of the calculations based on the growth of stalagmite in caves

* "Les Origines de l'Histoire." Brown's translation.

† "Modern Science in Bible Lands," pp. 244-45; 251-52.

and other uncertain data which have been held to indicate a greater lapse of time.

"If we identify the antediluvians of Genesis with the oldest men known to geological and archæological science, the parallelism is somewhat marked in physical characteristics and habits of life, and also in their apparently sudden and tragical disappearance from Europe and Western Asia, along with several of the large mammalia which were their contemporaries. If the deluge is to be accepted as historical, and if a similar great break interrupts the geological history of man, separating extinct races from those which still survive, why may we not correlate the two? If the deluge was misused in the early history of geology, by employing it to account for changes which took place long before the advent of man, this should not cause us to neglect its legitimate uses, with reference to the early human period. It is evident that if this correlation be accepted as probable, it must modify many views now held as to the antiquity of man. In that case the modern gravels and silts, spread over the plateaus between the river valleys, will be accounted for, not by any greater overflow of the existing streams, but by the abnormal action of currents of water diluvial in their character. Further, since the historical deluge must have been of very limited duration, the physical changes separating the deposits containing the remains of palæocosmic men from those of later date would in like manner be accounted for not by the slow processes imagined by extreme uniformitarians, but by causes of a more abrupt and cataclysmic character."*

We may proceed to inquire as to whether the position which we have now reached is likely to be permanent, or may represent merely one shifting phase of opinion. For this purpose we may formulate these conclusions in a few general statements, merely referring to the evidence on which they are based, as any complete discussion of this would necessarily be impossible within the limits of this article. We may first summarize the present position of the matter as indicated by historical and scientific research altogether independently of the Bible.

1. The recent discovery of the Chaldean deluge tablets has again directed attention to the statements of Berosus respecting the Babylonian tradition of a great flood, and these statements are found to be borne out in the main by the contents of the tablets. There is thus a twofold testimony as to the occurrence of a deluge in that Babylonian plain which the Old Testament history represents as the earliest seat of antediluvian man. As Lenormant has well shown, the tradition exists in the ancient literature of India, Persia, Phenicia, Phrygia, and Greece, and can be recognized in the traditions of Northern and Western Europe and of America, while the Egyptians had a similar account of the destruction of men, but

apparently not by water. Thus we find this story widely spread over the earth, and possessed by members of all the leading divisions of mankind. This does not necessarily prove the universality of the deluge, though every distinct people naturally refers it to its own country. It shows, however, the existence of some very early common source of the tradition, and the variations are not more than were to have been expected in the different channels of transmission.

2. Parallel with this historical evidence lies the result of geological and archæological research, which has revealed to us the remains and works of prehistoric men, racially distinct from those of modern times, and who inhabited the earth at a period when its animal population was to a great extent different from that at present existing, and when its physical condition was also in many respects distinct. Thus in Europe and Asia, and to some extent also in America, we have evidence that the present races of men were preceded by others which have passed away, and this at the same time with many important species of land animals, once the contemporaries of man, but now known only as fossils. These ancient men are those called by geologists later pleistocene, or post-glacial, or the men of the cave and gravel deposits, or of the age of the mammoth, and who have been designated by archæologists palæolithic men, or more properly, palæocosmic men, since the character of their stone implements is only one not very important feature of their history, and implements of the palæolithic type have been used in all periods, and indeed are still used in some places.

3. The prevalence among geologists of an exaggerated and unreasonable uniformitarianism, which refused to allow sufficient prominence to sudden cataclysms arising from the slow accumulation of natural forces, and which was a natural reaction from the convulsive geology of an earlier period, has caused the idea to be generally entertained that the age of palæocosmic men was of vast duration, and passed only by slow gradations and a gradual transition into the new conditions of the modern period. This view long was, and still is, an obstacle to any rational correlation of the geological and traditional history of man. Recently, however, new views have been forced on geologists, and have led many of the most sagacious observers and reasoners to see that the palæocosmic period is much nearer to us than we had imagined. The arguments for this I have repeated in so many forms in

* See also Howorth: "The Mammoth and the Flood," and papers by the Duke of Argyll in this Review, and by Prof. Prestwich in the "Journal" of the Geological Society, and by Andrews, Whistell, and others in America.

previous publications that I need not reiterate them here. A few leading points may, however, be noted. One of these is the small amount of physical or organic change which has occurred since the close of the palæocosmic period. Another is the more rapid rate of erosion and deposition by rivers in the modern period than had previously been supposed. Another is the striking fact that a large number of mammals, like the mammoth and woolly rhinoceros, seem to have perished simultaneously with the palæocosmic men, and this by some sudden catastrophe.* It has also been shown by Pictet and Dawkins that all the extant mammals of Europe already existed in the post-glacial age, but along with many others now altogether or locally extinct. Thus there seems to have been the removal over the whole northern hemisphere of a number of the largest mammals, while a selected number survived and no additions were made. Again, while at one time it was supposed that the remains of palæocosmic man and his contemporaries were confined to caverns and river alluvia, it is now known that they occur also on high plateaus and water-sheds, in beds of gravel and silt which must have been deposited there under conditions of submergence and somewhat active current drift, perhaps in some cases aided by floating ice.† Lastly, while, as must naturally be the case, in some places the remains of ancient and more modern men are mixed, or seem to pass into each other; in others, as in the Belgian and Lebanon caves and in the superficial deposits, there is a distinct separation implying an interval accompanied by physical change between the time of the earlier and later men.

Such considerations as these, the force of which is most strongly felt by those best acquainted with the methods of investigation employed by geologists and archaeologists, are forcing us to conclude: (1) That there are indicated in the latest geological formations two distinct human periods, an earlier and a later, characterized by differences of fauna, and of physical conditions, as well as by distinct races of men. (2) That these two periods are separated by a somewhat rapid physical change of the nature of submergence, or by a series of changes locally sudden and generally not long continued. (3) That it is not improbable that this greatest of all revolutions in human affairs may be the same that has so impressed itself on the memory of the survivors as to form the

basis of all the traditions and historical accounts of the deluge.

This being the state of the case, it becomes expedient to review our ideas of the ancient Hebrew records, from which our early, and perhaps crude, impressions of this event were derived, and to ascertain how much of our notions of the deluge of Genesis may be fairly deduced from the record itself, and how much may be due to more or less correct interpretations, or to our own fancy. In connection with this we may also be able to obtain some guidance as to the value to be attached to the Hebrew document as a veritable and primitive record of the great catastrophe.

The key to the understanding of the early human history of Genesis lies in the story of the fall of man, and its sequel in the murder of Abel by his brother Cain, the beginning of that reign of violence which endures even to this day. From this arose the first division of the human race into hostile clans or tribes, the races of Cain and Seth, on which hinges the history, characteristics and fate of antediluvian man, and, as we shall see in the sequel, from this arose profound differences in religious beliefs, which have tinged the theology and superstitions of all subsequent times. Of course, in making this statement I refer to the history given in Genesis, without special reference to its intrinsic truth or credibility, but merely in relation to its interpretation in harmony with its own statements.

It is further evident that this tragic event must have occurred in that Tigro-Euphratean region which was the site of Eden,* and that while the Sethite race presumably occupied the original home of Adam, and adhered to that form of religion which is expressed in the worship of Jahveh, the Coming Redeemer and the expected "Seed of the Woman," the other race spread itself more widely, probably attained to a higher civilization, in so far as art is concerned, in some of its divisions, and sank to a deeper barbarism in others, while it retained the original worship of God the Creator (Elohim). Hence the Sethite race is designated as the sons of Adam (Beni ha Adam), the true and legitimate children of the first man, and the Cainites as Beni Elohim, or sons of God.† The mixture of these races produced the godless, heaven-defying Nephelim, the Titans of the Old Testament, whose wickedness brought on the diluvial catastrophe. These half-breeds of the antediluvian time

* "Modern Science in Bible Lands," chap. iv.

† Howorth: "The Mammoth and the Flood."
 † Prestwich on deposits at Ightham, Kent, "Journal Geological Society," May, 1889.

† That this is the true meaning of the expressions in Genesis vi. I cannot doubt. See discussion of the subject in the work cited in previous note.

were in all probability the best developed, physically and perhaps mentally, of the men of their period; and but for the deluge they might have become masters of the world.

This question of different races and religions before the flood is, however, deserving of a little farther elucidation. The names Elohim and Jahveh are used conjointly throughout the Book of Genesis except in its first chapter, and their mode of occurrence cannot be explained merely on the theory of two documents pieced together by an editor. It has a deeper significance than this, and one which indicates a radical diversity between Elohist and Jahvists even in this early period. In the earliest part of the human history, as distinguished from the general record of creation, the two names are united in the compound Jahveh-Elohim, but immediately after the fall Eve is represented as attributing to, or identifying with, Jahveh alone the birth of her eldest son—"I have produced a man the Jahveh," and which may mean that she supposed Cain to be the promised manifestation of God as the Redeemer. Accordingly Cain and Abel are represented as offering sacrifice to Jahveh, and yet it is said in a verse which must be a part of the same document, that it was not till the time of Enosh, a grandson of Adam, that men began to invoke the name of Jahveh. It would seem also that this invocation of Jahveh was peculiar to the Sethites, and that the Cainites were still worshippers of Elohim, the God of nature and creation. Hence their title of Beni ha Elohim. Thus the division between the Cainite and Sethite races early became accentuated by a sectarian distinction as well. We may imagine that the Cainites, worshipping God as creator, and ignoring that doctrine of a redeemer which seemed confined to the rival race of Seth, were the deists of their time, and held a position which might, according to culture and circumstances, degenerate into a polytheistic nature-worship, or harden into an absolute materialism. On the other hand, the Sethites, recognized by the author of Genesis as the orthodox descendants of Adam, and invoking Jehovah, held to the promise of a coming Saviour and to a deliverance from the effects of the fall to be achieved by his means.

It is clear that, from the point of view of the author of Genesis, the chosen seed of Seth should have maintained their separation from a wicked world. Their failure to do this involves them in the wrath of Jahveh and renders the destruction of mankind necessary, and in this the whole Godhead, under its combined aspects of Elohim and

Jahveh, takes a part. A similar view has caused the Chaldean narrator to invoke the aid of all the gods in his pantheon to effect the destruction of man.

These considerations farther throw light on the double character of the deluge narrative in Genesis, which has induced those ingenious scholars who occupy themselves with analysis or disintegration of the Pentateuch, to affirm two narratives, one Elohist and one Jahvist.* Whatever value may attach to this hypothesis, it is evident that if the history is thus made up of two documents it gains in value, since this would imply that the editor had at his disposal two chronicles embodying the observations of two narrators, possibly of different sects, if these differences were perpetuated in the post-diluvian world; and farther, that he is enabled to affirm that the catastrophe affected both the great races of men. It farther would imply that these early documents were used by the writer to produce his combined narrative almost without change of diction, so that they remain in their original form of the alleged testimony of eye-witnesses, a peculiarity which attaches also to the Chaldean version, as this purports to be in the form given by Hasisatra, the Chaldean Noah himself.†

Let us now inquire into the physical aspects of the deluge, as they are said to have presented themselves to the ancient witness or witnesses to whom we owe the biblical account of the catastrophe; and let it be observed here that we are dealing not with prehistoric events but with a written history, supposed by some to have been compiled from two contemporary documents, and corroborated by the testimony of the ancient Chaldean tablets, copied by the scribes of Assurbanipal, apparently from different originals, preserved in very ancient Chaldean temples.

The preparation of an ark or ship, and the accommodation therein, not only of Noah and his family, but of a certain number of animals, is a feature in which most deluge narratives agree. This implies a considerable advance in the arts of construction and navigation, but not more than we have a right to infer from the perfection of these arts in early post-diluvian times, when it can scarcely be supposed that the new communities of men had fully regained the position of their ancestors before the destruction caused by the great flood. Lenormant, however, remarks here:

* See, for a very clear statement of these views, Prof. Green in "Hebraica," Jan., 1889, along with Dr. Harper's *résumé* of the Pentateuchal criticism in the previous number.

† Translation of G. Smith and others.

"The biblical narrative bears the stamp of an inland nation, ignorant of things appertaining to navigation. In Genesis the name of the ark, *Tēbāh*, signifies 'chest,' and not 'vessel;' and there is nothing said about launching the ark on the water; no mention either of the sea, or of navigation, or any pilot. In the *Epopée* of Uruk, on the other hand, everything indicates that it was composed among a maritime people; each circumstance reflects the manners and customs of the dwellers on the shores of the Persian Gulf. *Hasisatra* goes on board a vessel, distinctly alluded to by its appropriate appellation; this ship is launched and makes a trial-trip to test it: all its chinks are caulked with bitumen, and it is placed under the charge of a pilot."

This remark, which I find made by other commentators as well, suggests, it seems to me, somewhat different conclusions. The Hebrews when settled, either in Egypt or in Canaan, were near to the sea-coast, and familiar with boats and with the ships of the Phenicians. If, therefore, they persisted in calling Noah's ark a "chest," it must have been from unwillingness to change an old history derived from their Chaldean or Mesopotamian ancestors, or because they continued to regard the ark as rather a great box than a ship properly so called. On the other hand, it is likely that the particulars in the Chaldean account came from later manipulation of the narrative, after commerce and navigation on the Euphrates and Persian Gulf had become familiar to the Chaldeans. Thus in this as in other respects the Hebrew narrative is the more primitive of the two, and is consistent with the necessity of divine instructions to Noah, which, if he had been familiar with navigation, would not have been necessary.*

As in the Chaldean version, the biblical history begins with the specification of the ark. On this (*Elohistic*) portion, it is only necessary to say that the dimensions of the ark are large and well adapted to stowage rather than to speed, and that within it was strengthened by three decks and by a number of bulkheads, or partitions, separating the rooms, or berths, into which it was divided. Without, it was protected and rendered tight by coats of resinous or asphaltic varnish (*copher*), and it was built of the lightest and most durable kind of wood (*gopher* or *cypress*). Only two openings are mentioned, a hatch or window above, and a port or door in the side. There is no mention of any masts, rigging, or other means of propulsion or steerage. The Chaldean history differs in introducing a steersman, thus implying the means of propulsion as in an actual ship.

Noah is instructed, in addition to his own family, to provide for animals, two of every kind; but these very general terms are afterwards limited by the words "uph, bemah, and remesh," which define birds, cattle, and small quadrupeds as those specially intended. Noah's ark was not a menagerie, but a cattle-ship, capable perhaps of accommodating as many animals as one of those steamers which now transfer to England the animal produce of Western fields and prairies. The animals portrayed on the ancient monuments of Egypt and Assyria, however, inform us that, in early post-diluvial times, and therefore probably also in the time of Noah, a greater variety of animals were under the control of man than is the case in any one country at present.* In the passage referring to the embarkation, only the cattle and fowls are mentioned, but seven pairs are to be taken of the clean species which could be used as food, "seven seven," as the old record has it.† The embarkation having been completed on the very day when the deluge commenced, we have next the narrative of the flood itself. Here it is noteworthy that God (*Elohim*) makes the arrangements, and *Jahveh* shuts the voyagers in.

The first note that our witness enters in his "log" relates to his impressions of the causes of the catastrophe, which was not effected supernaturally, but by natural causes. These are the "breaking up of the fountains of the great deep" and the "opening of the windows of heaven." These expressions must be interpreted in accordance with the use of similar terms in the account of creation in Genesis i., the more so that this statement is a portion regarded by the composite theory as *Elohistic*. On this principle of interpretation, the great deep is that universal ocean which prevailed before the elevation of the dry land, and the breaking up of its fountains is the removal of that restriction placed upon it when its waters were gathered together into one place. In other words, the meaning is the invasion of the land by the ocean. In like manner, the waters discharged from the windows of heaven are those suspended in the cloudy reservoirs of the atmospheric expanse; equivalent, therefore, to the great rain extending for forty days, as stated in an explanatory clause. The Chaldean record

* Houghton: "Natural History of the Ancients," and "Trans. Society of Biblical Archaeology;" also representations of tame antelopes, &c., on Egyptian monuments.

† This has been considered a later addition; but the practice of all primitive peoples has sanctioned the distinction of clean and unclean beasts, which is merely defined in the Mosaic law, not instituted for the first time.

* See also the evidence of an inland position of the writers in the record of creation in Genesis i., as stated in my work cited in previous note.

adds the phenomena of thunder and tempest, but omits the great deep, an indication that it is an independent account and by a less informed or less intelligent narrator. It is worthy of note that our narrator has no idea of any river inundation in the case.

At this stage we are brought into the presence of the question: Is the deluge represented as a miraculous or a merely natural phenomenon? Yet, from a scientific point of view, this question has not the significance usually attributed to it. True miracles are not, and cannot be, contraventions or violations of God's natural laws. They are merely unusual operations of natural powers under their proper laws, but employed by the Almighty for effecting spiritual ends. Thus, naturally, they are under the laws of the material world, but, spiritually, they belong to a higher sphere. In the present case, according to the narrative in Genesis, the flood was physically as much a natural phenomenon as the earthquakes at Ischia, or the eruption of Krakatao. It was a miraculous or spiritual intervention only in so far as it was related to the destruction of an ungodly race, and as it was announced beforehand by a prophet. Had the approaching eruption of Krakatao been intended as a judgment on the wicked, and had it been revealed to any one who had taken pains to warn his countrymen and then to provide for his own safety, this would have given to that eruption as much of a miraculous character as the Bible attaches to the deluge. In the New Testament, where we have more definite information as to miracles, they are usually called "powers" and "signs," less prominence being given to the mere wonder which is implied in the term "miracle." Under the aspect of *powers* they imply that the Creator can do many things beyond our power and comprehension, just as in a lesser way a civilized man, from his greater knowledge of natural laws and command over natural energies, can do much that is incomprehensible to a savage; and in this direction science teaches us that, given an omnipotent God, the field of miracle is infinite. As *signs*, on the other hand, such displays of power connect themselves with the moral and spiritual world, and become teachers of higher truths and proofs of divine interference. The true position of miracles as signs is remarkably brought out in that argument of Christ, in which He says, "If ye believe not My words, believe Me for the works' sake." It is as if a civilized visitor to some barbarous land, who had been describing to an incredulous audience the wonders of his

own country, were to exhibit to them a watch or a microscope, and then to appeal to them that these were things just as mysterious and incredible as those of which he had been speaking.

Returning to the deluge, we may observe that such an invasion of the great deep is paralleled by many of which geology presents to us the evidence, and that our knowledge of Nature enables us to conceive of the possibility of greater miracles of physical change than any on record, such as, for instance, the explosion of the earth itself into an infinity of particles, the final extinction of the solar heat, or the accession to this heat of such additional fierceness as to burn up the attendant planets. All this might take place without any interference with God's laws, but merely by correlations and adjustments of them, as much within His power as the turning on or stopping of a machine is in the power of a human engineer. Further, such acts of divine power may be related to moral and spiritual things just as easily as any outward action resulting from our own will may be determined by moral considerations. The time is past when any rational objection can be made on the part of science to the so-called miracles of the Bible.

To return to the passengers in the ark. This must have been built on high ground, or the progress of the deluge must have been slow, for forty days elapsed before the waters reached the ship and floated it. It is not unlikely that the Ark was built on rising ground, for here supplies of timber would be nearer. It has puzzled some simple antiquarians to find dug-out canoes of prehistoric date on the tops of hills; but they did not reflect that the maker of a canoe would construct his vessel where the suitable wood could be found, since it would be much easier to carry the finished canoe to the shore than to drag thither the solid log out of which it was to be fashioned. So Noah would naturally build his ark where the wood he required could be procured most easily. The Chaldean narrator seems to have overlooked this simple consideration, for he mentions a launching and trial trip of the ship, a sure mark that he is a later authority than the writer in Genesis.

The inmates of the ark now felt that it was moving on the waters, a new and dread sensation which must have deeply impressed their minds, and they soon became aware that the ark not merely floated, but "went," or made progress in some definite direction. Remark the simple yet significant notes—"The ark was lift up from the earth," and

"the ark went upon the face of the waters." The direction of driftage is not stated, but it is a fair inference, from the probable place of departure in Chaldea and that of final grounding of the ark, that it was northward or inland, which would indicate that the chief supply of water was from the Indian Ocean, and that it was flowing inward toward the great sunken plain of interior Asia; which, however, the ark did not reach, but grounded in the hilly region known to the Hebrews as Ararat, to the Chaldeans as Nisir. A curious statement is made here (Elohists) as to the depth of the water being fifteen cubits. Even in a flat country so small a depth would not cover the rising grounds; but this is obviously not the meaning of the narrator, but something much more sensible and practical. It is not unlikely that the measure stated was the water-draught of the loaded ark, and that as the voyagers felt it rise and fall on the waves, they may have experienced some anxiety lest it should strike and go to pieces. It was no small part of the providential arrangement in their case that in the track of the ark everything was submerged more than fifteen cubits before they reached it. Hence this note, which is at the same time one of the criteria of the simple veracity of the history. The only other remark in this part of the narrative relates to the entire submergence of the whole country within sight, and the consequent destruction of animal life; and here the enumeration covers all land animals, and the terms used are thus more general than those applied to the animals preserved in the ark. The deluge culminated, in so far as our narrator observed, in one hundred and fifty days.

His next experience is of a gale of wind, accompanied or followed by cessation of the rain and of the inflow of the oceanic waters.* The waters then decreased, not regularly, but by an intermittent process, "going and returning;" but whether this was a tidal phenomenon or of the nature of earthquake waves we have no information. At length the ark grounded, apparently on high ground or in thick weather, for no land was visible; but at length, after two months, neighboring hill-tops were seen.

The incident of sending out birds to test the recession of the waters deserves notice, because of its apparently trivial nature, because it appears with variations in the Chaldean account, and because it has been treated in a remarkably unscientific manner by some critics. It indicates the uncertainty which

would arise in the mind of the patriarch because of the fluctuating decrease of the waters, and possibly also a misty condition of the air preventing a distinct view of distant objects. The birds selected for the purpose were singularly appropriate. The raven is by habit a wanderer, and remarkable for power of flight and clearness of distant vision. So long therefore as it made the ark its headquarters, "going and returning"* from its search for food, it might be inferred that no habitable land was accessible. The dove, sent out immediately after the raven,† is of a different habit. It could not act as a scavenger of the waters and go and return, but could leave only if it found land covered with vegetation. As a domesticated bird also, it would naturally come back to be taken into the ark. Hence it was sent forth at intervals of seven days, returning with an olive leaf when it found tree-tops above the water, and remaining away when it found food and shelter. The Chaldean account adds a third bird, the swallow—a perfectly useless addition, since this bird, if taken into the ark at all, would from its habits of life be incapable of affording any information. This addition is a mark of interpolation in the Chaldean version, and proceeded perhaps from the sacred character attached by popular superstition to the swallow, or from the familiar habits of the bird suggesting to some later editor its appropriateness. Singularly enough, the usually judicious Schrader, probably from deficient knowledge of the habits of birds, fails to appreciate all this, and after a long discussion prefers the Babylonian legend for reasons of a most unscientific character, actually condemning the perfectly natural and clear biblical story as artificial and due to a recent emendation. He says: "When the story passed over to the Hebrews, the name of the swallow has disappeared," and "it is only from the Babylonian narrative that the selection of the different birds becomes clear." This little disquisition of Schrader is, indeed, one of the most amusing instances of that inversion of sound criticism which results when unscientific commentators tamper with the plain statements of truthful and observant witnesses.

The uncertainty indicated by the mission of the birds seems to have continued from the first day of the tenth to the first day of the first month, when Noah at length ventured to remove the covering of the ark and inspect the condition of the surrounding

* Genesis viii. 1, 2. "And Elohims made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters abated," &c.

* Margin of Authorised Version; less fully, "to and fro" in the text.
† There is no reason to suppose, as some have done, a hiatus here in the narrative.

country, now abandoned by the waters but not thoroughly dried for some time longer. Still so timid was the patriarch that he did not dare without a special command to leave his place of safety. I am aware that if the two alleged documents are arbitrarily separated it is possible to see here some apparent contradiction in dates; but this is not necessary if we leave them in their original relation.*

It will be observed that a narrative such as that summarized above, bears unmistakably stamped upon it the characteristics of the testimony of an eye-witness. By whomsoever reduced to writing and finally edited, it must, if genuine, have come down nearly in its present form from the time of the catastrophe which it relates. It follows that the narrator leaves no place for the current questions as to the universality of the deluge. It was universal so far as his experience extended, but that is all. He is not responsible for what occurred beyond the limits of his observation, and beyond the fact that man, so far as known to him, perished. If, therefore, as some have held,† Balaam in his prophecy refers to Cainite populations as extant in his time, or if Moses declines to trace to any of the post-diluvian patriarchs the Rephaim, Emim, Zuzim and other prehistoric peoples of Palestine, we may infer, without any contradiction of our narrative, that there were surviving antediluvians other than the Noachidæ, whatever improbability may attach to this on other grounds, and more especially from the now ascertained extension of the post-glacial submergence over nearly all parts of the northern hemisphere.

Let it also be noticed that beyond the prophetic intimation to Noah, and the one expression, Jahveh "shut him in," which may refer merely to providential care, there is, as already remarked, nothing miraculous, in the popular sense of that term; and that mythical elements, such as those introduced into the Babylonian narrative, are altogether absent. The story relates to plain matters of fact, which if they happened at all any one might observe, and for the proof of which any ordinary testimony would be sufficient. It may be profitable, however, to revert here to the probable relation of this narrative to the geological facts already adverted to, and also its bearing on the mythical and polytheistic additions which we find in the deluge stories of heathen nations.

Regarding the biblical deluge as a record of a submergence of a vast region of Eur-

Asia and Northern Africa at least, while no similar catastrophe has been recorded subsequently, it is unquestionable that submergences equally important have occurred again and again in the geological history of our continents, and have been equally destructive of animal life. It is true that most of these are believed to have been of more slow and gradual character than that recorded in Genesis, but in the case of many of them this is a very uncertain inference from the analogy of modern changes; and it is certain that the post-glacial submergence, which closed the era of palæocosmic man and his companion animals, must have been one of the most transient on record. On the other hand, we need not limit the entire duration of the Noachic submergence to the single year whose record has been preserved to us. Local subsidence may have been in progress throughout the later antediluvian age, and the experience of the narrator in Genesis may have related only to its culmination in the central district of human residence.

It is needless, then, to enter into further details, though these are sufficient to fill volumes if desired, in proof of the remarkable convergence of history and geological discovery on the great flood, which now constitutes one of the most remarkable illustrations of the points of contact of science proceeding on its own methods of investigation and divine revelation, preserving the records of ancient events otherwise lost or buried under accretions of myth and fancy. I have elsewhere endeavoured to show* that the earliest races of palæocosmic men, the Canstatt and Cro-magnon races, very fairly correspond with what may have been the characteristics of the ruder tribes of Cainites, and that the antediluvian civilization indicated by the narrative of the deluge could scarcely be expected to have left many accessible remains, though it is implied in the fact that the post-diluvian nations present themselves to us at once with a somewhat advanced condition of the arts, especially in Chaldea and in Egypt.

There are many other points relating to the deluge which invite more detailed discussion, as, for instance, its absolute date, its precise geographical limitations, and its relation to archæology and to theories of development. These I have discussed elsewhere, and have not space to refer to them here. It may, however, be proper to suggest to speculative archæologists that they cannot safely assume that all antediluvian

* See Green, "Hebraica," *l. c.*

† Motais, "Deluge Biblique."

* "Modern Science in Bible Lands."

or palæolithic tribes were barbarous or semi-brutal, or that there was a continuous development of humanity without any diluvial catastrophe. It is also somewhat rash to carry back the chronology of Egyptians and Babylonians to times when, as we know on physical evidence, the Valley of the Nile was an arm of the sea, and the plain of the Euphrates an extension of the Persian Gulf. It is fortunate for the Bible that such assumptions do not occur in its teaching.

It is well, however, to consider shortly the fact that the new light we are obtaining respecting antediluvian man and the deluge will enable us better to understand the origin and significance of myths of heathen antiquity based on the traditions of these early events. One intention of the early chapters of Genesis was evidently to inculcate that historical view of idolatry which traces the gods of the heathen to early heroes and patriarchs. Hea, Hasisatra, Merodach, Ishtar, and a host of other mythical personages of the Assyrian pantheon are now resolving themselves into purely human beings, who figure as men and women in the Pentateuch. No illustration of this is more patent than that of Ishtar, the Astarte of the Syrians, the Artemis of the Greeks, and who has been identified with the chief female divinity of many other ancient nations, even with that Diana whom "all Asia and the inhabited world worshippeth."

The Chaldean deluge tablets for the first time introduce her to us as an antediluvian goddess, and inform us that she is the deified mother of men, the same with the biblical Isha or Eve. In the crisis of the deluge we are told, "Ishtar spoke like a little child, the great goddess pronounced her discourse, Behold how mankind has returned to clay. I am the mother who brought forth men, and like the fishes they fill the sea. The gods, because of the angels of the abyss, are weeping with me." Ishtar is thus the mother goddess, mourning the destruction of her children, though herself gone into the heavens. In Chaldea, as in the Bible, she is the mother of the promised seed, and, according to the tradition, her worship began in Eden, or Idinu, in southern Babylonia.* But what is her connection with Tammuz, the Adonis of the Greeks, so called from the Semitic title Adonai, my lord, applied to him. Ishtar has been represented as the bride of Tammuz; but it now appears that in the oldest Babylonian legend she is his mother,† that he was a shepherd dwelling in Eden, and murdered by his brother,

Adar, who is also a god, more especially a god of war; and mourned for by his mother, whose celebrated descent into Hades is a myth based on this relation. In short, the story of Ishtar, Tammuz, and Adar, the fertile parent of so varied and widespread mythology, is merely a version of the story of Cain and Abel, and hence the belief that the murder of Tammuz was the cause of the deluge. Hence, also, the commemoration of the death of Tammuz by the annual lamentation of the women—"weeping for Tammuz,"* and this rite was probably antediluvian, and a superstition of the Sethites rather than of the Cainites.

Oppert regards the legend of Tammuz and Ishtar as a solar myth, and supposes that the story of Cain and Abel was based on it. But a family history of crime and sorrow is a much more real and probable thing as a basis for tradition than a solar myth, and naturalists at least will be disposed to invert the theory and to believe that the simple Bible story was the foundation of all the varied cults and superstitions that clustered round Ishtar and Tammuz, as well as personages like Osiris and Isis, who seem to have been later avatars or revivals of the same tale.

It would be easy to show that the deluge story has intimate connections with other ancient myths and superstitions, as well as with the results of modern archaeology and geology. But were this all, our inquiry, however interesting and curious, would have little practical value. It has two important bearings on the present time. Christianity founds itself, its founder himself being witness, on the early chapters of Genesis, as history and prophecy, and the treatment which these ancient and inspired records have met with in modern times at the hands of destructive criticism is doing its worst in aid of the anti-Christian tendencies of our time. To remove the doubts that have been cast on these old records is therefore a clear gain to the highest interests of humanity, and if theology and philology are unable to secure this benefit, natural science may well step forward to lend its aid. Another connection with present interests depends on the fact that, while superstitions akin to that which deified the mother of the promised seed, and introduced the world-wide cults of Astarte and Aphrodite, still reign over great masses of men, absolute materialism and desperate struggle for existence among men and nations are growing and extending themselves as never before since the

* Sayce, Hibbert Lectures.

† *Ibid.*

* Ezekiel viii. 14.

antediluvian times, and are provoking a like signal and direful vengeance. In the midst of all this, Christians look forward to the second coming of Jesus Christ to destroy the powers of evil and to inaugurate a better time; and it was He who said—"As it came to pass in the days of Noah, even so shall it be in the days of the Son of Man." Let us remember the old story of the flood of Noah lest that day come on us unawares.

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC SEE OF BALTIMORE.

BY WILLIAM STEVENS PERRY, BISHOP OF IOWA.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, Nov. 16, 1889.

THERE has been celebrated, both in the old world and in the new, the centenary of the consecration in the "upper room" at Aberdeen by the College of Scottish Bishops on November 14th, 1784, of Samuel Seabury, D.D., *Oxon.*, to the Episcopate of Connecticut. With like honor as with equal cause, the centenary of consecration at Lambeth chapel, February 4, 1787, by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishops of Bath and Wells, and Peterborough, of William White as Bishop of Pennsylvania and Samuel Provoost as Bishop of New York,—the first Bishops for America in the English line,—has been celebrated on both sides of the Atlantic. The Churches of the Anglican communion throughout the world took note in their observance of this centennial anniversary of the completion of the canonical number of bishops for the transmission of the episcopal office to all time to come in the Church of the United States. Shortly, Virginia will celebrate the centenary of the consecration at Lambeth of James Madison, the first Bishop of that See. A little later, Maryland will observe the centenary of the consecration of Thomas John Claggett, D.D., the first bishop consecrated on American soil and uniting in himself the succession of the Scottish and the English lines.

The Romish hierarchy, though a little lagging in these centennial observances, is about to commemorate, not the consecration of its first bishop which took place on the Feast of the Assumption, August 15, 1790, but the establishment by papal bull of the See of Baltimore over which the amiable and excellent Carroll was to be made bishop agreeably to the request of the Romish priests in America. It is possible that there may

be a display of the usual astuteness of the Roman authorities in this choice of the date of commemoration. In marked contrast with the pains taken in the cases of Seabury, White and Provoost, and, in fact, in all subsequent American consecrations, that three bishops, at least, as prescribed in the ancient canons, should take part in the conferring of the episcopal office, the first incumbent of the new See of Baltimore was consecrated by a single bishop and one, too, *in partibus*,—a titular bishop of Rama, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Walmsley, the senior Vicar Apostolic of the Roman Catholics of England, assisted only by two priests. This consecration by a single bishop was contemplated in the papal bull as will be seen below. It was done in a private chapel belonging to the estate of a Romanist gentleman, and although "the richness of the vestments" of the Bishop of Rama and the newly-made Bishop of Baltimore, "the music of the choir," the "multitude of wax-lights" and "the ornaments of the altar," seem to have impressed the narrator of this event, these accessories of the function will scarcely make up for the obscurity and irregularity of this act which gave to the Romanists of the United States the first prelate of their communion and the one through whom alone until a comparatively recent date all their consecrations are derived.

The register of Lambeth—that which contains the entry of Archbishop Parker's consecration—contains the record duly certified and attested of the consecration of White and Provoost, and at a later date that of Madison. The "Concordate" and the letter of consecration of Seabury, duly signed and sealed by the Scottish College, are still to be seen in confirmation of the event they record. It is so with the papers attesting the due and canonical admission to his sacred office of the first Catholic Bishop of Maryland, Dr. Claggett. Of the irregular establishment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the United States, the rare tract, we reprint, is a proof, and we submit that in comparison with the abundant evidence afforded in the cases of the canonical conferring both in Scotland and England of the Episcopal office for the United States of the true Catholic succession, the consecration of which this tractate is proof, is wanting both in dignity, in authority and in accordance with Catholic and primitive usage. To those who regard the fiat of the pontiff as overriding the ancient canons, it may be satisfactory. The true Catholic must pronounce this act done in the chapel of Ludlow Castle on the Feast of the Assumption,

1790, both irregular, uncanonical, and wanting in that publicity which is an important part of such a function.

The Roman Catholic succession in the United States thus depending on a single thread, was, we believe, never strengthened until the arrival of the Papal Nuncio, Bedini, who in the struggles preceding the unification of Italy had won an unenviable reputation. Known as the "Butcher of Bologna" this prelate was deemed by many as having vitiated his Episcopal character by the ruthless massacre which he ordered or at least condoned. We submit that these circumstances combined make more of a "Nag's Head consecration" among our Roman Catholic brethren than can in justice, or historically, be laid at our door.

The history of the pamphlet from which we reprint the authority of his holiness Pope Pius VI. for constituting the new See of Baltimore in Maryland, is, in itself, interesting.* Procured in London by the late Historiographer of the Church, the Rev. Francis Lister Hawks, D.D., LL.D., while in search of material for the elucidation of the history of the American Church, this copy, believed by Dr. Hawks to be almost if not wholly unique, was presented by him to the writer with the injunction to keep it with care as a paper of great interest and importance. Reproduced a number of years ago by the photolithographic process for the members of "The Historical Club," one of the few copies of this fac-simile fell into the hands of some Roman Catholic by whom it was pronounced to be "a Protestant forgery." The original was thereupon submitted to no less an authority than the distinguished Roman Catholic historian, John Gilmary Shea, LL.D., who, on examination, acknowledged the authenticity of the pamphlet, the existence of which, however, he had not previously known. It is given *verbatim et literatim*.

THE AUTHORITY OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS
VI. FOR CONSTITUTING THE NEW SEE
OF BALTIMORE IN MARYLAND.
TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL
FOR THE REMEMBRANCE OF POSTERITY.

When from the eminence of our apostolical station, we bend our attention to the

* The title-page bears a wood-cut reproduction of the seal of the new See of Baltimore. In the outer circle are the words *Ne derelinquas nos Domine Deus Noster*, surmounted by a cardinal's hat, and above the crossed keys are the words, in a circle, *Joannes Epis. Baltimorensis*, MDCCXC. Within the circle formed by these words are the thirteen stars grouped around a representation of the Blessed Virgin crowned, holding in one hand a sceptre terminated by a cross, and in the other the Holy Child with the aureole.

different regions of the earth, in order to fulfil to the utmost extent of our power the duty which our Lord has imposed upon our unworthiness of ruling and feeding his flock; our care and solicitude are particularly engaged, that the faithful of Christ who dispersed through various provinces are united with us by Catholic communion, may be governed by their proper pastors and diligently instructed by them in the discipline of evangelical life and doctrine. For it is our principle, that they who relying on the divine assistance have regulated their lives and manners, agreeably to the precepts of Christian wisdom, ought so to command their own passions as to promote by the pursuit of justice their own and their neighbor's spiritual advantage; and that they, who have received from their bishops, and by checking the intemperance of self-wisdom, have steadily adhered to the heavenly doctrine delivered by Christ to the Catholic Church, should not be carried away by every wind of doctrine, but grounded on the authority of divine revelation should reject the new and varying doctrines of men, which endanger the tranquillity of government, and rest in the unchangeable faith of the Catholic Church. For in the present degeneracy of corrupt manners into which human nature ever resisting the sweet yoke of Christ is hurried, and in the pride of talents and knowledge which disdains to submit the opinions and dreams of men to the evangelical truth delivered by Jesus Christ, support must be given by that heavenly authority which is entrusted to the Catholic Church as to a steady pillar and solid foundation which shall never fail, that from her voice and instructions mankind may learn the objects of their faith and the rules of their conduct, not only for the obtaining of eternal salvation, but also for the regulation of this life and the maintaining of concord in the society of this earthly city. Now this charge of teaching and ruling first given to the apostles and especially to St. Peter the prince of the apostles, on whom alone the Church is built, and to whom our Lord and Redeemer entrusted the feeding of his lambs and of his sheep, has been derived in due order of succession to bishops, and especially to the Roman Pontiffs, successors of St. Peter and heirs of his power and dignity, that thereby it might be made evident that the gates of hell can never prevail against the Church, and that the divine founder of it will ever assist it to the consummation of ages, so that neither in the depravity of morals nor in the fluctuation of novel opinions the episcopal succession shall ever fail

or the bark of Peter be sunk. Wherefore it having reached our ears that in the flourishing commonwealth of the Thirteen American States many faithful Christians united in communion with the chair of Peter, in which the centre of Catholic unity is fixed, and governed in their spiritual concerns by their own priests having care of souls, earnestly desire that a bishop may be appointed over them to exercise the functions of Episcopal order, to feed them more largely with the food of salutary doctrine, and to guard more carefully that portion of the Catholic flock; we willingly embraced this opportunity which the grace of Almighty God has afforded us to provide those distant regions with the comfort and ministry of a Catholic Bishop. And that this be effected more successfully and according to the rules of the sacred canons, we commissioned our venerable brethren the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, directors of the Congregation *de propaganda fide*, to manage this business with the greatest care and to make a report to us. It was therefore appointed by their decree, approved by us, and published the twelfth day of July of the last year, that the priests who lawfully exercise the sacred ministry and have care of souls in the United States of America, should be empowered to advise together and to determine, first, in what town the Episcopal See ought to be erected, and next who of the aforesaid priests appeared the most worthy and proper to be promoted to the important charge, whom we, for this first time only, and by special grace permitted the said priests to elect and to present to this apostolical See. In obedience to this decree the aforesaid priests exercising the cure of souls in the United States of America, unanimously agreed, that a bishop with ordinary jurisdiction ought to be established in the town of Baltimore, because this town situate in Maryland, which province the greater part of the priests and of the faithful inhabit, appeared the most conveniently placed for intercourse with the other States, and because from this province Catholic religion and faith had been propagated into the others. And at the time appointed for the election, they being assembled together, the sacrifice of holy Mass being celebrated, and the grace and assistance of the Holy Ghost being implored, the votes of all present were taken, and of twenty-six priests who were assembled twenty-four gave their votes for our beloved son John Carroll, whom they judged the most proper to support the burden of episcopacy, and sent an authentic instrument of the whole transaction to the

aforesaid Congregation of Cardinals. Now all things being maturely weighed and considered in this congregation, it was easily agreed that the interests and increase of Catholic religion would be greatly promoted, if an Episcopal See were erected at Baltimore, and the said John Carroll were appointed the bishop of it. We therefore, to whom this opinion has been reported by our beloved son Cardinal Antonelli, Prefect of the said congregation, having nothing more at heart than to ensure success to whatever tends to the propagation of true religion and to the honor and increase of the Catholic Church; by the plenitude of our apostolical power, and by the tenor of these present, do establish and erect the aforesaid town of Baltimore into an Episcopal See forever, for one bishop to be chosen by us in all future vacancies; and we therefore, by the apostolical authority aforesaid, do allow, grant and permit to the bishop of the said city, and to his successors in all future times, to exercise Episcopal power and jurisdiction, and to hold and enjoy all and every right and privilege of order and jurisdiction, and of every other Episcopal function, and which bishops constituted in other places are empowered to hold and enjoy in their respective churches, cities and dioceses, by right, custom or by other means, by general privileges, graces, indults and apostolical dispensations, together with all pre-eminencies, honors, immunities, graces and favors, which other cathedral churches, by right or custom, or in any other sort, have, hold and enjoy. We moreover decree and declare the said Episcopal See thus erected, to be subject or suffragan to no metropolitan right or jurisdiction, but to be forever subject immediately to us, and to our successors the Roman Pontiffs, and to this apostolical See. And till another opportunity shall be presented to us of establishing other Catholic Bishops in the United States of America, and till other dispositions shall be made by this apostolical See, we declare, by our apostolical authority, all the faithful of Christ living in Catholic communion, as well ecclesiastics as seculars, and all the clergy and people dwelling in the aforesaid United States of America, though hitherto they may have been subject to other bishops of other dioceses, to be henceforward subject to the Bishop of Baltimore in all future times; and to this bishop and to his successors we impart power to curb and check, without appeal, all persons who may contradict or oppose their orders, to visit personally or by deputies all Catholic churches, to remove abuses, to correct the manners of

the faithful, and to perform all things which other bishops in their respective dioceses are accustomed to do and perform, saving in all things our own authority and that of this apostolical See. And, whereas by special grant, and for this first time only, we have allowed the priests exercising the cure of souls in the United States of America, to elect a person to be appointed bishop by us, and almost all their votes have been given to our beloved son John Carroll, Priest; we being otherwise certified of his faith, prudence, piety and zeal, inasmuch as by our mandate he hath during the late years directed the spiritual government of souls, do therefore, by the plenitude of our authority, declare, create, appoint and constitute the said John Carroll Bishop and Pastor of the said Church of Baltimore, granting to him the faculty of receiving the rite of consecration from any Catholic Bishop holding communion with the apostolical See, assisted by two ecclesiastics vested with some dignity, in case that two bishops cannot be had, first having taken the usual oath according to the Roman Pontifical. And we commission the said bishop-elect to erect a church in the said city of Baltimore, in form of a cathedral church, inasmuch as the times and circumstances may allow, to institute a body of clergy deputed to divine worship and to the service of the said church, and moreover to establish an Episcopal seminary either in the same city or elsewhere as he shall judge most expedient, to administer ecclesiastical incomes, and to execute all other things which he shall think in the Lord to be expedient for the increase of Catholic faith and the augmentation of the worship and splendor of the new-erected church. We moreover enjoin the said bishop to obey the injunctions of our venerable brethren the Cardinals, Directors of the sacred Congregation *de propaganda fide*, to transmit to them at proper times a relation of his visitation of his church, and to inform them of all things which he shall judge to be useful to the spiritual good and salvation of the flock trusted to his charge. We therefore decree that these our letters are and ever shall be firm, valid and efficacious, and shall obtain their full and entire effect, and be observed inviolable by all persons whom it now doth or hereafter may concern; and that all judges, ordinary and delegated, even auditors of causes of the sacred apostolical palace, and Cardinals of the holy Roman Church must thus judge and define, depriving all and each of them of all power and authority to judge or interpret in any other manner, and declaring all to be null and

void, if any one, by any authority, should presume, either knowingly or unknowingly, to attempt any thing contrary thereunto. Notwithstanding all apostolical, general or special constitutions and ordinations, published in universal, provincial and synodical councils, and all things contrary whatsoever.

Given at Rome at St. Mary Major, under the Fisherman's Ring (Seal) the 6th day of November 1789, and in the 15th Year of our Pontificate.

DUPLICATE.

[L.S.]

R. CARD. BRASCHI ONESTI.

THE COLLEGE OF CARDINALS.

From the New York *Freeman's Journal* (Roman Catholic),
Dec. 26, 1889.

EDITOR STEAD, of the London *Pall Mall Gazette*, is now in Rome, writing up the institutions there. His letters are very interesting, and doubtless he means well; but unfortunately he lacks that intimate knowledge of Catholicity, which is the conspicuous failing of many of the most cultivated and best disposed Protestant writers on such subjects. The topic of his last letter is the College of Cardinals, and he grieves over the fact that it is composed of thirty-two Italian and only twenty-eight non-Italian members. He says:

"It is not impossible that the Holy See, with its great position and splendid traditions of human service, may become the centre of organized human effort for the amelioration of the lot of men, not by virtue of any arbitrary authority, human or divine, but because it may make itself the heart and the brain of collective humanity. . . . No one would, of course, propose to demand the rigorous application of a system of proportional representation to the College of Cardinals. But the general principle that the interests of unrepresented people are apt to be overlooked holds so far good in affairs ecclesiastical as well as in affairs political that it may be worth while roughly to jot down side by side the number of red hats allotted to the different nations and the number that would be accorded to them if distribution went according to population. I take the figures from the 'Annales des Missions Catholiques' and the official 'Gerarchi:':"

Country.	Catholics.	Cardinals.	Due Proportion.
France	36,400,000	7	10
Austria-Hungary.....	29,580,000	4	8
Italy	28,000,000	33	8
Spain	16,870,000	4	4
Germany	16,230,000	3	4
Belgium	5,500,000	—	2
Poland	4,500,000	1	1
Portugal	4,300,000	2	1
Ireland	3,960,000	..	1
Great Britain	1,320,000	3	..
Other Countries.....	6,000,000	..	2
America	51,000,000	2	15
Asia	9,000,000	..	3
Africa	2,600,000	1	..
Australia	670,000	1	1
		60	60

At the end of his communication Mr. Stead draws some conclusions, and we trust he will forgive us if we say they are of an amusing character to a Catholic mind: "But I have said enough to show how utterly impossible it is for even the Catholic nations to regard the Curia as in any sense an adequate representation of their interests. If ever the Pope is to be commander-in-chief of the humanitarian forces of the world, he will have to recruit his headquarter's staff more evenly from all the nations under his control." We should remark, to begin with, that Mr. Stead fails to grasp the fact that the Catholic Church's government is not formed on the idea of representation, but on that of merit; she is not local, but universal, and has the whole world to choose from; her ministers are not called, but sent. The principle of representation is admitted as a subordinate one, and, all other things being equal, it undoubtedly decides the choice. No Bishop in America, we know for certain, has ever been chosen without the most searching and anxious inquiry. But still the principle which rules is that of sending, not calling. It is the principle established by Christ.

The College of Cardinals, as a body, performs only one function—that of electing the Pope. But this is an event of such rare occurrence that Mr. Stead does not refer to it. His complaint is especially of the Curia—the congregations or courts of Rome; and he totally misapprehends their functions. They are executive and judicial organizations, and have no legislative powers. The law-makers of the Church are the Bishops of the whole world in Ecumenical Council assembled, or else the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*. Moreover, the Pope would hardly undertake to promulgate a dogma without calling a universal assemblage, unless the pronouncement was imperatively called for

by the Catholic world at a time when the assembling of the Council was impossible. In any event the Pope would act rather as judge than promulgator. Protestant controversialists have long reproached Rome with originating nothing new. That is so. The chief function of the Church's government is to preserve. It is the *depositum* of the Apostolic faith, which has remained essentially unchanged from the beginning. But deductions could be made from them, and can still, and over these the vast army of theologians frequently argued for hundreds of years before the Church decided. Perhaps the most striking instances are the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Pope's Infallibility, which were disputed points until the latter half of the present century, though they were contained embryonically in the original creed. For a full exposition of this subject we would refer Mr. Stead to Cardinal Newman's "Development of Christian Doctrine."

The reason why there is a preponderance of Italian Cardinals in the Congregations of the Vatican is purely practical. Of the Italian Cardinals, too, perhaps the majority are drawn from Rome and its immediate vicinity. The Sacred College originated in Rome, and at first its members consisted only of the Roman pastors. If Mr. Stead will look into the "Catholic Dictionary" he will see how gradually the scope of collegiate membership extended, and he surely knows that even yet every Cardinal is the pastor of a Roman Church, which he is obliged to support, without which he could not be a Cardinal at all.

The members of the Congregations are chosen from among the Cardinals by the Pope just as the President of the United States chooses the members of his Cabinet. The Pope selects those he thinks most capable of directing the different Executive and Judicial Departments of the Papal Government. Two considerations incline his choice: First, they must be the most thoroughly posted in canon law, moral theology, dogma, and the doctrinal disputes of the past and present; secondly, they must live in Rome. Roman Prelates are, naturally, the best informed on the subjects mentioned, and therefore they predominate in the Roman Courts. Eminent Protestants like Guizot, Leibnitz, Neander, and others, who devoted, not a mere transient attention, but a deep study, to the history of Christianity, have acknowledged the impartial fairness of these tribunals and the vast services rendered to civilization by the Papacy.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CENTENNIAL.

From *The Central Christian Advocate* (Methodist), St. Louis,
Nov. 20, 1889.

ONE hundred years ago, or, to be exact, on Nov. 6, 1789, the Roman Catholic hierarchy was established in the United States by the appointment of John Carroll as bishop of Baltimore. At that time the Catholic population of the country was estimated at about 30,000. The Romish Church has in the United States to-day, according to Archbishop Ryan, 9,000,000 adherents, 8,000 priests, 10,000 churches and chapels, 27 seminaries and 650 colleges and academies, and over 3,000 parish schools. These figures are not remarkable when we consider what proportion of the emigration to America during the last twenty-five years has been Roman Catholic. The 9,000,000 Romanists—if we admit that there are that many in this country—represent but a very small per cent. of actual converts. The Catholic Church in the United States has largely grown at the expense of Romanism in Europe. But it is all the stronger on this account, for the loyalty of the European accessions is not affected by any fondness for American institutions. The close of its first century in this country finds the Church of Rome firmly established in the cities and large towns, more aggressive in its movements, and growing in political power. The centennial of its establishment in the United States was celebrated on Sunday, Nov. 10, with imposing services in the cathedral at Baltimore. It was a great demonstration, in full keeping with the importance of the event. Archbishop Ryan, of Philadelphia, made the address in the morning, and Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, in the evening. The address of the former was much more liberal and patriotic than the usual public speeches of Roman ecclesiastics, and parts of it read as if they were prepared especially with the view of making an impression upon the non-Catholic population of the country.

But the most significant feature of the centennial celebration was the Congress of Catholic Laymen, held in Baltimore Nov. 11 and 12. This Congress, the first of the kind that ever assembled in the United States, is a new departure that the Protestant public will regard with especial interest. It seems to have been quite successful, and arrangements were made to hold in 1892 an international congress of like character in the city where the World's Fair is located. The Congress discussed such subjects as lay

action in the Church, the rights of the State in education, the independence of the Holy See, capital and labor, Sunday observance, etc., and issued a platform of principles, or rather a line of practice in regard to public questions, which is quite out of the usual line. What is intended as the most assuring confession is made in regard to their devotion to republican institutions, and that the truest patriotism is not incompatible with perfect loyalty to the Church of which they are members. It favors Christian education, by which, however, it means the inculcation of Roman Catholicism with secular education, and makes the old plea that the public school system is godless, and therefore the parochial school system is to be developed. Some recognition is taken of the disposition among the members of the Church to form class societies, yet they are urged to adopt the St. Vincent De Paul Society as the typical Roman Catholic Church organization, which is rather of a benevolent character. Among the recommendations are congregational singing, and the co-operation of the laymen with the clergy in the discussion of all questions which relate to the social life of the community. The most striking part of the paper is that relating to co-operation with non-Roman Catholic citizens to procure proper Sunday observance, the suppression of intemperance, and the destruction of the influence of the saloon in politics. Of course the Roman Catholic idea of Sabbath observance and temperance is not that of Protestantism. But it does, after all, show that the laymen are in advance of the priests in some of these matters. The paper in several parts runs counter to the ordinary sense and principles of Romanism. It is an evidence, however, that the laymen are constituting themselves an advanced column. Their association with Protestants has in some measure produced a spirit of liberalism in opposition to the doctrine of their Church. But we are not to look for a revolution in the thinking or practice of Romanism. The spirit and utterances of the Papacy have always been against the principles of free speech and a free press. It has been always and is to-day a spiritual despotism so far as it can exert its power.

The centennial celebration concluded with the dedication on Nov. 13 of the Catholic University at Washington. Bishop Gillmour, of Cleveland, preached the sermon on this occasion. The banquet which followed the formal dedication was attended by the President and vice-President of the United States and the members of the Cabinet.

THE MORMON QUESTION.

From *The Living Church* (Episcopalian), Chicago, Dec. 21, 1889.

It is an encouraging sign of the times that public sentiment has been aroused to see that Mormonism is a menace to our institutions. As long as it was supposed that it was merely a question of religion, the spirit of religious liberty which permits every one in this land to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, operated to grant freedom to the followers of Brigham Young. Thus it has happened that polygamy has been winked at and murder condoned, and the community at Salt Lake suffered to grow by immigration, and flourish by means of their industry.

But of late years, the country has been waking up to the fact that the Mormon Church is not only immoral, but also disloyal, that its spirit is inimical to American institutions, and that its continued existence means a continual defiance of the laws of the United States. Senator Edmunds' bill has had good effect in this, that it has been the cause of exposing the animus of Mormon institutions. As the provisions of that bill have been put in execution, it has had the effect of revealing facts which go to show that nothing short of extermination of Mormonism as an institution will reach and cure that hideous plague spot in our land.

A recent decision of the United States court in Utah confirms our opinion. Application for citizenship had been made by certain Mormons. The applications were denied by the court on the ground that "the evidence establishes beyond any reasonable doubt that the endowment ceremonies are inconsistent with the oath an applicant for citizenship is required to take, and that the oaths, obligations, or covenants there made or entered into are incompatible with the obligations and duties of citizens of the United States."

It is evident, however, that denial of citizenship will not remove the evil. The cause remains imbedded in the constitution of the Mormon Church. It is a case which calls for radical treatment.

A correspondent of the *Chicago Tribune* has given a most practical and sensible suggestion. That paper, at the conclusion of an excellent article on the subject, asked: "What, then, is the remedy that will extirpate the evil, which has lasted, and strengthened, and spread for half a century?" We quote our writer's reply, at some length:

"Having some knowledge of Mormon matters, I answer that one of the remedies is,

stopping the source of supply at Castle Garden, New York.

"Most of the Mormon recruits are drawn from the lower classes of English, Welsh, and Scandinavian people.

"They have been able to get a few proselytes from the ignorant white population of Georgia and North Carolina, but the great bulk of Mormon emigrants come through Castle Garden, New York, and if that emigration can be stopped, the Mormon leaders will be at a loss for recruits. The duty of Congress is therefore to close this avenue of supply, as it is believed can be done.

"The money to get these Mormon emigrants to our shores and thence to Utah is provided by the Mormon Church, which, it is generally understood, keeps a large deposit in London. The Mormon property confiscated under the Edmunds law by the Government represented, is, I believe, less than \$500,000. It has been estimated that for the last twenty years the tithes collected by the Mormon Church from their people in Utah, Nevada, and Idaho, have not been less than \$1,000,000 annually. This money is used for bringing fresh supplies of Mormons to Utah, and no doubt a large portion goes to enrich the few Mormon leaders.

"Now, if the 'sinews of war' can be attacked or made useless for the purpose for which it is employed, another remedy will be found effective in extirpating the 'evil.'

"Still another remedy suggested is the disfranchisement of every Mormon who has practised polygamy and been convicted under the Edmunds law, or who is not willing to take the oath of allegiance to the United States, and absolve himself from his allegiance to the Mormon Church. When an alien takes out his naturalization papers he is required by the Constitution to absolve his allegiance to all foreign powers, especially that one he hailed from and belonged to.

"Every Mormon gives his allegiance to the Mormon Church first, last, and all the time, and this Mormon Church has been and is to-day a great political power, having for one of its characteristic features disloyalty to our Government. . . . The duty of Congress is now to strike down this hydra-headed monster, which will bring trouble and possibly bloodshed in the future if longer dallied with as it has been."

When public opinion speaks in this emphatic manner, there is some hope that the time is not far distant when drastic remedies will be applied, and this reproach upon our civilization be removed. Congress is now in session, and if our readers would

write to their Congressmen, calling attention to existing facts, and urging legislation, much good might be accomplished.

PLAGIARISM.

BY J. B. GRAVES.

From *The Christian-Evangelist* (Disciple), St. Louis, Nov. 23, 1889.

It is our duty and pleasure as students to gather knowledge from every available source—from the word and works of God, and from the sayings and doings of men; and this knowledge we must make known to men for their profit and improvement. For the purpose of increasing knowledge, we have established colleges and curriculums, rostrums and pulpits, and publish books and papers by the million. All these are legitimate sources of information. Through all these agencies we try to fill the minds of men with knowledge, and then we say to them, "Go, preach."

If they go, and from the fund of wisdom they have been amassing, frame their own sermons, speeches or writings, using independence and originality in construction, diction and expression, they do well, and about all they can do. Originality in the absolute is impossible, and were it possible, it would measurably be undesirable; for it would render useless all our study and observation. It is only relative; we cannot invent any new simple ideas, not one; but we can bring into existence new combinations of thought. By comparison, reflection and induction, we can reach novel conclusions, different from all others; or possibly the same conclusions, but by a different mental route. By such mental processes, too, we can give birth to new expressions and combinations of thought, or put old truths in a new dress. Some housewives cannot cut a child's garment unless they have a pattern or seen the shape. They can follow the pattern made by someone else, but cannot give shape to a new garment. They have a genius for imitation, but none for creation.

So it is with preachers. Some have the faculty of following in the lead of other men, using their outlines and their ideas, giving expression to their thoughts with very little variation of form, thus stultifying their own powers of creation by voluntarily accepting materials ready-made. While they have a faculty for following, for taking and imitating, they have no faculty for breaking away from the deep-worn ruts and blazing

out a road of their own, for making and teaching. The ideal housewife is one who has genius and spirit enough to originate a few new things, one who is capable sometimes of introducing something surprising, of making something hitherto unknown, one who can produce something original, one who is not content to be continually following the pattern of somebody else. The ideal preacher is not an echo, but a voice. Breaking away from the lines and outlines of other men, he marks out a course of his own. His subject is his own, yet it may be the same as, or the modification of, another's. His method of treatment is his own, yet the material of the treatment may be drawn from others. It is perfectly legitimate for us to draw argument from, or find corroboration in, another. But in getting this material, we should be careful of two things:

(1) To give proper credit for the material if we use it without alteration. If a whole sermon is so used, it should be so accredited to its real author. Any considerable extract should be treated in the same way. If, however, we give the drift of a man's thought, if we contract, expand, or otherwise modify it, we are under no obligation so to accredit it; for in its alteration we have asserted our individuality, and the transformed or deformed production is not his, but ours. But even in such mutilation we should be careful to stamp ourselves so indelibly upon the matter of thought, so that our hearers cannot say, "That's Spurgeon." And if such mutilations of another's sermon, to get one of our own, is practised to save the work of preparing a new and fresh one, it is as bad as stealing it outright, for laziness is as sinful in a preacher as literary theft.

(2) We should be careful, second, to make the material ours. We can so master a thought, so thoroughly understand it, as to make it a part of us, and when it is perfectly mastered and moulded into our possession, so that we can express it in a variety of shapes, we can express it as our own, and need not refer to the real author of it, or the one from whom we derived it. The same may be said of a theory, or a whole system of philosophy. I will illustrate what I mean. "The earth is round like a ball." That is a fact of geography. I learned it of Monteth. But I have so mastered the truth that it is mine; and when I use it, I am under no obligation to state the source of my information. "The square root of 25 is 5." I learned that from Ray. But that truth is so mastered and fixed in me, that it is no more Ray's than it is mine. And when I state that or any other mathematical fact,

I am not under necessity of quoting my author. Truth is eternal; these authors do not originate them, they only discover them. By hard study I may thoroughly understand the Nebular Hypothesis which accounts for the development and organization of the heavens and the earth. And when the items of the philosophy are well understood, we do not need to say, "Thus saith La Place." We can state the theory or the facts independently, as though they were our own. And so of all other knowledge.

But if in imparting knowledge I should attempt to make the impression that I discovered a certain truth, or framed a certain philosophy, or composed a certain fine passage, or prepared a certain striking sermon, when in fact I borrowed it from another, I am guilty of plagiarism. To use another's ideas is not plagiarism, but to use another's ideas as your own, is. Webster defines a plagiarist to be "one who purloins another's writings, and offers them to the public as his own." To commit a sermon and deliver it as an original one is plagiarism. To take a sermon outline prepared by another and use it "in toto," text, division, subdivision, argument, conclusion and application, is another example of the same thing. But if you get an idea here, an argument there, an illustration yonder, and bring these together in a new relation, in a new arrangement, the sermon is a new one, though every idea may be old and borrowed. That is not plagiarism. Yet, in bringing this foreign material into our sermons, we must guard against a too free use, and an exactness of quotation. It is better for us and our hearers, too, to give the thought of another in our own language. I would lay down this rule for us as preachers: Keep away from skeletons and outlines; depend upon genius for creation of forms and expressions, and put as much individuality into the sermon as possible. It is better to preach a poor sermon of our own than a good one of Talmage's.

THE PRE-HISTORIC BOOK CONCERN.

From *Zion's Herald* (Methodist), Boston, Dec. 4, 1889.

IN studying the Book Concern, whose centennial we celebrate, we need to use the new historic method which traces existing institutions back into earlier ages. Back of the historic Book Concern was a primitive institution on horseback, out of which the current establishment grew. If the itinerant, with his saddle-bags stored with vital

literature, had not gone before, the princely House on Fifth Avenue would not have followed. In germ, the Book Concern was in those inevitable saddle-bags. To spread our books was an indispensable part of the preacher's task; for, in carrying out his mission of evangelism, he used the press as well as the living voice. The idea originated with Wesley, and was imported into America by the preachers he early sent over. They came with a book as well as a spoken Gospel.

On the frontier they were the pioneers in the business, preceding not only the shopkeeper, but the enemy who uses the press to scatter in the virgin soil the seeds of evil. This early use of the press was of unspeakable service to the cause of Christ. It tended to neutralize the errors which inevitably spring up in new countries. In the controversies then rife with deism, Calvinism, and other forms of error, the book served a good purpose. Besides the thunderbolts he could hurl from the pulpit, a book or tract might be left behind as a torpedo to explode under the feet of the errorist.

In this way the early preacher did much to shape the reading of his own flock and the community. By circulating instructive, vital books, he kept those which were deleterious or less valuable out of the way, and preoccupied the minds of the readers with better things.

The books of the early preachers were mostly printed in England. The societies here, until 1785, were under Wesley, who felt the same concern to give them good reading as a good Gospel. Robert Williams began to reprint some of Wesley's works; but the Conference forbade him to do so without the authority of the founder and the consent of the Conference. They respected Wesley's copyright and were jealous of works which could not meet the approval of the brotherhood.

With the early itinerants, book-selling, so far from being a mercenary business, was an important evangelistic method. The money was of little importance compared with the soul-saving, for which they exhibited an eager desire. The two ends they ever held in view are admirably set forth in the address, made to the people by the Philadelphia Conference in 1799, written by Rev. Ezekiel Cooper, the book steward. "It is well understood," is the language of the address, "that the book business among us is designed for the excellent purpose of spreading and cultivating moral and religious knowledge; hence we confine ourselves to the publication of books and pamphlets upon the subjects of morality and divinity, more

especially such as treat on experimental and practical religion. It is also known that the pecuniary profits arising from the business are appropriated to the exclusive benefit of the connection, as an auxiliary to us in spreading the Gospel of our salvation the more extensively through the world."

In 1789 the book business had grown so that it seemed good to the Conference to appoint John Dickins "general book steward," or manager of the book business in the church. In doing this, the Conference had no idea of building a mammoth publishing house. The Book Concern was the invention of the newly-chosen steward. His business brain suggested the importance of a headquarters for the business; and in securing this, he was building larger than he knew. He planned for a small store-room; the small store-room was the germ of the greatest religious book-making establishment on the globe.

THE BINGHAM MEMORIAL.

From *The Advance* (Congregational), Chicago, Dec. 1, 1889.

THE man who preached the first Christian sermon in Honolulu, of the Sandwich Islands, was Rev. Hiram Bingham. That was April 25, 1820. Mr. Bingham, a native of Vermont, was born October 30, just one hundred years ago. The one hundredth birthday of this honored apostle to the Hawaiian Islands was most appropriately commemorated in the Kawaiahao Church, Honolulu, of which we find an exceedingly interesting account in the *Hawaiian Gazette*, as also in *The Friend*, published in that city. Pictures were shown of the two grass buildings first used as churches. The first, erected in 1821, was destroyed by fire in 1829; the second, erected in 1829, was 196 feet long by 68 feet wide, and would accommodate 4,000 persons. This also was a thatched building. The present church is built of stone. Rev. H. H. Parker gave the historical address, exhibiting, among other things, the original constitution of the church, as organized in 1826, with the autograph signatures of the Kaahuawana, Kalaimoka and John Li. The venerable Dr. Lowell Smith told of the wonderful work of God in the great revival of 1837 to 1840, when he was associated with Pastor Bingham. A sermon in the Hawaiian was preached by Rev. J. K. Iosepa, of Hana, followed by addresses in English by Rev. Hiram Bingham, and by Gen. Marshall, who came to the islands in 1830, who spoke of his association for some twenty years with Gen. S. C. Armstrong, a

son of Mr. Bingham's successor as pastor of this church, and whose work at Hampton for negroes and Indians Whittier speaks of as "the noblest work now being done in the country;" and another address by Joshua Kua. The following is a portion of it:

"One hundred years ago to-day was born the man who laid the foundations of this house. Fifty years ago he, with his faithful workers, laid the corner-stone. He and his colleagues brought to our people the greatest gift that heaven has bestowed upon mankind, a Christian faith and a Christian civilization. Hiram Bingham and his colleagues have passed from human vision; the places that once knew them, know them no more. But the work they began here will never cease. That work takes hold on the things that are lasting. They preached not themselves, but Jesus Christ the Lord of all. They came not to set up a material kingdom. They came to plant the seed of a spiritual kingdom that should give life to us all. They looked not at the things which are seen; for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal. The seed which they planted will grow on continuously because it takes hold on the things that are unseen and eternal.

"Of the three pioneers in the great work which was begun here in 1820, Mr. Whitney went to his rest at Lahainaluna, Mr. Thurston was laid away in the beautiful Nuuanu Valley, while Mr. Bingham died far away from here in his native land. Had he been permitted to choose where he should close this mortal life, doubtless he would have said, 'Let me lie down among the loved people with whom I have labored.'

"It is fitting, therefore, that we should place here, by the side of the corner-stone of the church which he with his people laid more than fifty years ago, this tablet in memory of Hiram Bingham. Let us never forget the first message that he delivered to the people of this land: 'Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be for all people.'

"Let us also ever cherish the memory of these good Aliis and their people, whose name has come down to us from a former generation, like a sweet savor.

"Underneath that corner-stone is a copper plate upon which is the first engraving ever done by a Hawaiian. The work was done by Kapeau, and this is the inscription he made. 'This is a house for Jehovah the God of Heaven, the Father; the Son and the Holy Spirit; a house of prayer erected by the first church and congregation of

Honolulu, a place for them to worship the true God. Those people who have been very helpful in this work are Kamehameha III., Kaahumanu II., Auhea, Liliha, Kehauonohi, Kehuanaoa, Governor of Oahu, Pahi, and Koohokaloale."

"My friends, great changes have taken place within the last fifty years; but the work that Mr. Bingham and his co-laborers began here has gone right along through all these changes. And the next fifty years will see still greater progress."

At the conclusion of Mr. Kua's address, the white marble Tablet attached to the front of the church (the marble from Rutland, Vt.), was unveiled by Hiram Bingham, 3d, a lad of thirteen. The following is the inscription which it bears:

A CENTENNIAL MEMORIAL OF
HIRAM BINGHAM.

Born in Bennington, Vt., October 30th,
1789.

Died in New Haven, Ct., November 11th,
1869,

aged 80 years.

This slab is placed here in grateful remembrance of a pioneer missionary by descendants of Hawaiians (aided by his children among whom he preached Christ for more than twenty years. He preached the first sermon ever delivered in this city April 25th, 1820, from "Fear not; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy." Here he taught confiding kings, queens, and chiefs, faced dangers, and bore calumny from abroad; aided in reducing the language to writing, translated much of the Bible, composed books, hymns and tunes; here he baptized a thousand converts, planted a church, planned this edifice, and with his loving people, on June 8th, 1839, laid this adjoining corner-stone, beneath which was placed a Hawaiian Bible, first published May 10th, 1839. From here, amid loud wailings of hundreds of his flock, he sailed on August 3d, 1840, to revisit his native land; but never returning, was not with them, when, on July 12th, 1842, with joyful acclamation, they thus dedicated this church,

"To Jehovah our God forever and ever."

THE MISSION [OF THE UNIVERSALISTS] TO JAPAN.—THE LEADER SELECTED.

From *The Universalist*, Chicago, Dec. 14, 1889.

THE General Secretary, Rev. Dr. Demarest, writes as follows under date of Nov. 30,

conveying an important and pleasing announcement:

"I have the pleasure to announce to the subscribers to the fund for the Mission to Japan and to all well-wishers of the enterprise, that the Committee on Foreign Missions, with the approval of such of the Trustees of the General Convention as could be consulted, have entered into preliminary arrangements with Rev. Geo. L. Perin, of Boston, as the leader of the mission. He expects to enter upon the mission in the early spring and to continue in the service for at least five years. It is believed that the appointment will give great satisfaction to the friends of the mission; and a large increase of subscriptions is expected."

The above announcement was ready for our columns last week, but was withheld. It is now authorized by all parties in interest. It will be greeted with sincere pleasure throughout our Church. It gives assurance that the long-contemplated mission to Japan is approaching its consummation, and under circumstances which will inspire a fair degree of confidence in the success of the enterprise. Rev. Mr. Perin, who is thus constituted the leader in this mission, is one of our young clergymen who has achieved substantial success in the two important positions which he has occupied in the pastorate—Bryan, O., and Boston. He is now the pastor of the Shawmut Avenue church, in the latter city, where he has been eminently successful in the five years of his ministry. Owing to changes in the population, and other embarrassments of the situation, it was an exacting and unpromising field when he took charge; but by dint of well-directed perseverance, large industry, good pulpit ability and excellent pastoral gifts, he has revived the church, and placed it in a condition of substantial prosperity. It will require a large degree of sacrifice for this people to give up their earnest young pastor for work in the distant foreign field. But the parish will doubtless rise to the occasion, and while regretting the combination of circumstances which calls Mr. Perin away, will regard it as an honor to their church that their pastor is to become the first Universalist missionary to Japan.

The selection of Mr. Perin as the leader in this initial missionary enterprise of our Church will be regarded as a master-stroke for the success of the mission. It is one of the very best of half-a-dozen selections that could have been made. It has ability, youth, activity, and supreme devotion to our Church on its side. It will furnish the best of evidence to our people that the mission is

planned on a broad scale and proposes to succeed. It will doubtless result in contributing a large measure of confidence to the movement among the great body of our people which will result in the speedy filling up of the subscription to the needful amount. The only regret is that it will take from our church work at home a valuable and much-needed worker. But "the field is the world," and whether at home or abroad, in Christian or pagan land, the gospel needs its workers, and we should rejoice when they go forth to their appointed fields. May the Lord grant his blessing to this new movement in our Church, and bestow all needful wisdom and strength to him who has now accepted its duties and responsibilities.

INDIA'S CRITICAL PERIOD.

BY B. H. BADLEY, D.D.

From *The Central Christian Advocate* (Methodist), St. Louis,
Nov. 13, 1889.

OF all times this is the time when the Church should be at work in India—and hard at work. It is a critical time. "The old order changeth, giving place to the new." The new India springing up is very different from the old; it must be permeated with the ennobling spirit of Christianity.

There is much unrest in India. The great deeps are being stirred as never before. The determination to blindly follow ancestral examples is weakening; the Hindu begins to feel that whether he will it or not he must change; he is awaking to the thought that the world is moving, and the thought brings discomfiture: he turns to his priests for help, but they too are changing and are helpless. English education and the railway are largely responsible for this unrest. Government schools, mission schools and private institutions are found throughout the empire. A growing desire to know English fills these schools with students. Each student as he returns to his village home on holidays is a kind of missionary or tract distributor; he carries news regarding the great outside world, and the result is amazing. He gives up his old faith; the rude stone idol in the village temple receives no more floral offerings at his hands; his example is noted and often copied—and the village priest can do nothing.

The railway is a great iconoclast. Worshipped at first by the simple-minded Hindus, the iron horse goes thundering up and down the Ganges Valley, across the plains

of Rajputana, down the Western Mountains to Bombay, across the Madras Presidency and so on to the farthest south. The railway, as has frequently been said, breaks down caste. At the outset the wily Brahmans, foreseeing the mischief that was sure to come, petitioned the Government to supply special carriages for Brahman passengers, but the request was refused. The alternative was to have nothing to do with the railway; but the Brahmans were not pious enough for such self-denial, and so they have taken their places in the waiting-rooms and in the cars side by side with low caste and outcasts; who can measure the results? The railway, too, makes pilgrimages vastly easier than in the olden times. Then it was a fortnight's occupation going from Lucknow to Benares on pilgrimage; now, for a small sum of money, "the mail" carries the pilgrim to the sacred city in less than twelve hours. It will hardly be maintained that the "railway pilgrim" is as devout as the other.

There is political unrest and agitation in India. A National Congress is held every year. This brings together delegates of all classes and religions—natives—from all parts of the empire. Congress meetings are held in all the large cities; eloquent speeches are made. The agitators, composed of so many diverse elements, are slow in advocating social reforms, but loud in demanding larger representation in the Government Councils of India, and also in Parliament. What the outcome will be none can tell. India is not yet ready for self-government.

There is a constant religious agitation. The *Brahmo Samaj* movement, which, under Keshub Chandra Sen, gave promise a dozen years ago of introducing a religious revival throughout India, is now doing next to nothing. It seems to have died when its founder died; in Lucknow the Brahmo Church stands almost neglected. In Calcutta Sen's followers are divided into two hostile camps, and there seems no hope for reconciliation.

The *Arya Samaj* is intensely active. This movement originated with Pandit Dayanand Saraswati, who died a few years ago. It is a desperate effort to call back the Hindus to the old paths, to the old Vedas; desperate because of the tricks and devices resorted to. The leaders, taking their cue from the missionaries, for whom naturally they have no love, have introduced schools and orphanages, and are working diligently to get possession of orphans. They have set up printing presses, and are publishing newspapers in the vernacular and in English.

They are sending out books and tracts full of misrepresentations of Christianity, and, besides, they have set to work a number of preachers who, like the missionaries, repair to the street corners and to the great religious fairs to preach their peculiar doctrines. In some places these zealous, misguided people have greatly damaged our missionary work. They have enticed away enquirers who were about to be baptized; they have seized new converts and hired them to give up Christianity. In many places they have overshot the mark. Recently in Allahabad their newspaper published a scandalous account of the conversion of a Hindu to Christianity, making an attack upon Rev. Mr. Lucas, of the American Presbyterian Church. The falsehoods were so numerous and glaring that the Arya editor was obliged to recall his statements in the next issue. The Arya preachers have everything to help them: the sympathy of their co-religionists, the national feeling of reverence for the ancestral faith, and many other influences. Their desire to overcome the influence of the missionaries, especially by street-preaching, has caused them to study the Bible very carefully and diligently. The result no doubt will be that some Arya Saul will become a helpful Paul.

As another illustration of the activity of the Hindus in new lines, reference may be made to the "Hindu Tract Society" at Madras. This is doing its best to tear down the work of the missionaries; naturally it turns to England and America and reprints the coarse attacks of infidel writers upon Christianity. The Society will probably have a brief existence. Hindus do not enjoy paying for such things; it "goes against the grain."

The Mohammedans are not asleep. They are not given to change. Their creed remains the same and their policy is unchanged. Their hands are tied in India, and doubtless they see but little daylight ahead. In some quarters they are becoming stirred up to greater zeal. Recently a large meeting was held in Lucknow, and it was decided that every Mohammedan was to urge upon every other Mohammedan the necessity of being present in the mosque for Friday prayers. The attendance has increased.

This agitation is not to be wondered at, it is a thing to be expected. Anything is better than stagnation. It is for such a time as this the Church exists. Its mission is to lay hold of and elevate men and women. It wins its greatest victories in the face of difficulties and upheavals. It is comforting to know that the Church in India is wide

awake. It takes in the situation, and is planning accordingly. The splendid opportunity is not trifled with. Every possible agency is being laid hold of and used for Christ. It is seed-sowing time; it is also harvest time.

Our Methodist Church is doing its full share in at least most ways. We are in sad need of re-enforcements. In the midst of these exciting days and events, with these vast possibilities before us, it is sad to think that we have fewer Methodist missionaries in India to-day than we had a year ago. The ranks are not being kept full. What is to be done? We do not underestimate the worth of our native preachers; they are noble workers. We must decrease; they shall surely increase. But in the face of the influences that surround us, and the difficulty of the work upon us, we are constrained to call for volunteers, for re-enforcement from home. Who will come? We need good thinkers, logical writers, eloquent preachers, consecrated men of God. None can come too well prepared.

As an illustration of what is being done by our Church the *Central* readers will be glad to know that Bishop Thoburn is writing a sermonette each week, and these are being published at our Methodist "Book Concerns" in English, Bengali, Urdu and Hindu, in all 50,000 copies each week; and these are being carefully distributed in the zenana, the Mission school, the railway station, the shop and street. Great good is sure to follow.

SELF-COMPLACENT IGNORANCE.

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), New York, Nov. 23, 1899.

"No, I am not a member of any church," we recently heard a man say, "and I don't profess to be a Christian, but I am a better Christian than most church-members, for my religion is that of the Sermon on the Mount." Having no personal acquaintance with the speaker and no knowledge of his life, we could not question the truthfulness of the assertion, albeit the wise man's saying came to our mind and almost to our lips, "Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth." It would be interesting to know if this man's friends and neighbors think that he lives up to his religion and exemplifies the Sermon on the Mount in his life better than most church-members embody their professed belief in their lives.

With every wish to be charitable, one cannot help drawing the conclusion that a man who speaks thus is densely ignorant, both of

his own heart and of the Sermon on the Mount. Most of us can be very self-complacent so long as we look only on the good side of our own characters and contemplate only our good deeds. We can admire the Sermon on the Mount so long as we look only at its surface and think only of the beautiful and comforting things in it. We can be complacent because we do not try ourselves by any lofty moral standard, we can admire because we do not or will not comprehend the sweep of Christ's moral teaching. But complacency vanishes when we have a vision of perfect holiness; admiration gives place to terror when we feel the force of Christ's moral law.

For the Sermon on the Mount, so far from being a very easy law to live by, marks the utmost requirements of a holy law. The Ten Commandments were far exceeded by this new morality. The old law forbade murder; the new law teaches that to hate one's brother is as guilty in God's sight as the spilling of the blood. The old law was satisfied to prohibit the evil act; the new law is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart. What man can say that he keeps the law of God thus interpreted? No sermon ever preached will so develop the sense of sin in an honest man as the Sermon on the Mount if it is read with an understanding mind. The self-complacent will be pricked in their hearts, and the law will prove to them a schoolmaster to lead them to Christ, if they honestly study this Scripture.

Perhaps there is no truth that is less enforced in these days, or that stands more in need of re-enforcement, than the holiness of God. For in the holiness of God we have the ground for the perfection of the moral law and the spiritual nature of its requirements. So long as moral law was looked upon as a mere code of rules for living, an arbitrary series of prohibitions—a law, in short, that depended for its authority on the sovereign pleasure of One who was omnipotent—its sanctions were mainly those of fear. But now we have reached the truer conception, that moral law is the expression of God's inmost nature, and merely requires of us likeness to him, the main sanction is that of love. But the first step to turn men from self to God is to give them a glimpse of God's holiness by the side of their own sinfulness, a knowledge of what his law really requires and of what they are by nature able to give. If this does not turn men to a Saviour who is able to save them from their sins and to sanctify them fully by his grace, they are past saving. It will at least destroy

their complacency. If they choose evil for their good, they will make the choice deliberately and intelligently, with no delusion that evil is good, but knowing it for what it is and preferring it.

TIME SPENT IN PRAYER.

From *The St. Louis Christian Advocate* (Methodist), Dec. 18, 1889.

THE Bible does not tell us how long we are to pray. Neither does it give direction as to the number of prayers we are to offer daily. Nor how much time each prayer should consume. All this is left to the spiritual demands of each day, and to the variable demands of spiritual need. While the commandment does not say, thus often and thus long, yet time is an essential factor in prayer. While many private prayers, in the nature of things, must be short; while all public prayers ought to be short; while there is ample room for and value put on ejaculatory prayer, yet in our private communions with God time is a feature essential to its value. Much time spent with God is the secret of all successful praying. Prayer which is felt as a mighty force is the mediate or immediate product of much time spent with God. Our short prayers owe their point and efficiency to the long ones that have preceded them. The minute prayer of prevalence cannot be prayed by one who has not prevailed with God in a mightier struggle of long continuance. Jacob's victory of faith could not have been gained without that all night wrestling. God's acquaintance is not made by pop calls. God does not bestow his gifts on the casual or hasty comers and goers. Much with God alone is the secret of knowing him and of influence with him. He yields to the persistency of a faith that knows him. He bestows his richest gifts upon those who declare their desire for and appreciation of those gifts by the constancy as well as earnestness of their importunity. Christ, who in this as well as other things is our example, spent many whole nights in prayer. His custom was to pray much; he had his habitual place to pray. Many long seasons of praying make up his history and character. Paul prayed day and night. It took time from very important interests for Daniel to pray three times a day. David's morning, noon and night praying were doubtless on many occasions very protracted. While we have no specific account of the time these Bible saints spent in prayer, yet the indications are that they consumed

much time in prayer, and on some occasions long seasons of praying was their custom.

We would not have any one think that the value of their prayers is to be measured by the clock, but our purpose is to impress on our minds the necessity of being much alone with God, and that if this feature has not been produced by our faith then our faith is of a feeble and surface type.

The men who have most fully illustrated Christ in their character, and have most powerfully affected the world for him have been men who spent so much time with God as to make it a notable feature of their lives. Charles Simeon devoted the hours from 4 till 8 in the morning to God. Mr. Wesley spent two hours daily in prayer. Samuel Rutherford was up at 3 in the morning to give himself to prayer. Archbishop Leighton was so much alone with God that he seemed to be in a perpetual meditation. John Fletcher often spent whole nights in prayer. Bishop Ken was so much with God that his soul was said to be God-enamored. David Brainerd prayed hour after hour daily. Joseph Alleine spent from 4 till 8 in the morning with God. Luther spent his three best hours in prayer. John Welch prayed seven or eight hours a day. Robert McChesney gave an hour after tea and from six to eight in the morning to God. There was no tendency in these men to count their prayers, or measure them by the watch. Neither did their being so much alone with God detract from their working energies; they were eminently men of practical as well as personal holiness; they were great workers as well as great prayers; these must go together in the Christian life.

The monks, in the interest of praying, divorced praying and working. We, in the interests of an impatient and almost frivolous working, have done the same thing. God has joined them together; let us not put them asunder. Mighty prayers make mighty workers. The secret of might in work lies in mighty praying.

BROTHER SMILER.

BY CLIFTON M. NICHOLS, SPRINGFIELD, O.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Dec. 5, 1899.

BROTHER SMILER's original and real name was Jones. He was at first a smiler, in a weak and wicked way, at the corner grocery, and his "smiles" cost him about two hundred dollars a year. It also cost him his self-respect, his good clothes, his peace of mind, his social standing, and

everything like real happiness. It also took away his health, and at last, when prostrated on his bed, and humiliated, discouraged and hopeless, the pastor of the Pondale church came to see him. His wife told him that the minister had called for him, and he said to her, "Is it possible that that good man has come to see me?" It was. The good man went to his bedside, gave him a warm, cordial greeting, and attempted to administer to him the consolations of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and with a wonderful degree of success. For a new light shone into the soul of Jones. A new purpose was begotten in his heart. A new and kindly illumination blazed from his eye.

When Jones got about again, he was a new man. He was washed and clean shaved, his clothes were neatly brushed, and his shoes well polished. He at once joined the church, and he was so bright and hearty and cordial—he shook hands so vigorously, he entered into every kind of Christian and church work with such a will, and his face was continually on such a broad grin—that it was easy to see how Brother Jones very soon became known and mentioned everywhere as Brother Smiler. He was soon stationed at the front door of the church, and he greeted the incomers with such fervor, and blazed upon them with such genuine warmth, that they went to their pews with a real glow, and proved good ground for the seed the pastor sowed.

The smiles of Brother Smiler proved a power in the community. One day he met an inebriate and smiled on him. This was something the man of drams was not accustomed to, and it touched him. Brother Smiler said to him: "I used to be as you are, and I was miserable. I spent two hundred dollars each year at the saloon. Now I am a Christian, I put two hundred dollars each year in the church treasury, and I am happy." The testimony was taken as evidence. The inebriate was soon washed, and combed, and in his right mind. And so Brother Smiler went on smiling and shaking hands, in the name of the Lord, and there was much less smiling of the wrong, hurtful sort, and much more smiling of the right sort, in all that region round about.

This may be an improbable story, but it is true.

MORTGAGING CHURCH PROPERTY.

From *The Living Church* (Episcopalian), Chicago, Dec. 14, 1899.

SOME time ago it was stated in *The Living Church* that one of the Brooklyn

churches was proposing to put a mortgage on its property amounting to \$50,000, when the Bishop would not permit the sum to exceed \$35,000 and then only under certain conditions. This action of the Bishop led *The Brooklyn Eagle* to consult the books in the registrar's office and bring to light the mortgages resting on all the churches in Brooklyn, and Kings County in which Brooklyn is included. The showing is a remarkable one, and though not wholly correct, *The Eagle* reaffirms that it is substantially so, while it is plainly impartial. It is certain at least that the churches in all the denominations have largely put to sea in the same boat, whatever their chances and their fortunes in doing so.

According to *The Eagle's* figures, 303 of the 371 churches in Brooklyn and Kings County are "equipped" with mortgages, amounting to the neat little sum of \$3,339,253, the order of the equipment being in the larger denominations as follows: Congregational churches, \$157,987; Lutheran, \$161,213; Reformed, \$235,600; Baptist, \$384,630; Presbyterian, \$399,500; Protestant Episcopal, \$411,400; Methodist, \$415,632; Roman Catholic, \$1,173,291. It will thus be seen that the Roman Catholic Church has so far distanced its competitors that if they wish to get even with it they must borrow in sums ranging from \$25,000 to \$50,000 each. Indeed, according to *The Eagle's* statement, the average mortgage now resting on each of 43 Roman Catholic Churches in the city and county, is \$27,472, while including the entire number, 64, it is \$18,333. On these mortgages *The Eagle* says the churches are paying \$50,000 a year in interest, while first and last they have paid \$1,000,000, or sufficient to build five first-class churches.

It is very certain, again, that Bishop Littlejohn and Bishop Loughlin have a very different way of looking at the matter of mortgaging Church property. According to the canon, it is the right of the former to veto a mortgage so far as it seems to him excessive, and it is on this ground that his right has been exercised, though but rarely. On the other hand, Bishop Loughlin seems to have known no law in mortgaging Church property, and to have exercised his rights without let or hindrance. In other words, beginning as far back as 1854, there are 39 mortgages standing in the Bishop's name, while in case of half-a-dozen churches the mortgages run from \$35,000 to \$110,000. That is certainly piling it on. No wonder that the Bishop has got the inside track, and that several institutions charged him

only four and a half per cent., while in the same year, as *The Eagle* states, they have charged good Protestants six and seven per cent. Plainly, the only thing to do is for the latter to borrow more freely and mortgage more heavily, if they want to be accommodated. And when the Bishop has borrowed half a million, or in exact numbers, \$449,500, from a single savings bank, let the others make it a half million better and so bring down the rates to four per cent, and possibly three and a half.

As showing how a church may abandon itself when it gets in the mortgaging way, *The Eagle* states that a single Methodist church has placed eleven mortgages on its property, a single Baptist Church fifteen, and a single Reformed church twenty-two! This gives an idea to work on. If the Protestant churches of Brooklyn and Kings County do not wish to encumber their property in single, solid amounts, ranging from \$35,000 to \$110,000, let them divide up such frightful sums into mortgaged amounts which shall make them seem harmless, not to say inviting. According to *The Eagle*, the mortgaged debts of twenty churches, all Protestant except five, amount to \$1,000,000. Now how easy for twenty other churches to place upon their property from eleven to twenty-two mortgages, each, and to borrow another million in ways so much less objectionable when brought to the inspection of the public. It would take only forty churches to raise two millions in this way, while the rates very possibly need not be more than three per cent.

But jesting aside, *The Eagle's* showing has made evident two things: First, that the churches of all denominations have felt constrained to be heavy borrowers and to encumber a large percentage of all their property. Whether the financiering has been good or bad, it has been true of all, and when the churches have largely had the advantage of business men, it would be hasty to conclude that their financiering was bad, as a rule. The truth is, in a city of such phenomenal growth as Brooklyn, it was considered better to have mortgaged churches than not to have them at all. This was evidently Bishop Loughlin's view of the matter, who seems to have largely mortgaged some churches in order to build others, together with Church institutions. Moreover, there is some justice in the reasoning that those who in other years are to have the advantage of the churches, should, if need be, share in the burdens of building them.

On the other hand, it is plain to see that a general mortgaging has been gone into,

which now, as ever, is sorely crippling scores of churches, as it is sure to do for years to come, if indeed many of them do not break down under their indebtedness. A glance at the list shows that very many churches have done nothing toward clearing off their mortgages, and that many others have added one mortgage to another, and are still struggling with their triple or quadruple burdens. All may yet go well if the tide of population sets in favorably and the preachers are popular, but what if matters take shape in the other direction? How many contingencies which make the paying of a church debt well-nigh hopeless and impossible!

Altogether, Bishop Littlejohn has doubtless done wisely in setting down his foot. No one knows so well as a bishop how the financial question drags with most churches, even when it does not drag them down: What shifts and turns to get through the year! What is worse, how often the financial burden weighs on the hearts of priest and people, to the grievous hindering of their work! How much more than often the burden takes the shape of a mortgage and a mill-stone hanging round their neck from which there is no hope of deliverance! Such being the case, is it not a bishop's duty to say to the churches under him, "Keep out of debt, if possible; if debt is necessary, make it as light as possible, and get rid of it as soon as possible?"

PASTORAL VISITING.

BY REV. JUDSON TITSWORTH, MILWAUKEE.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Dec. 19, 1889.

MUST it go? There are many who say it, more who suspect it, and all thoughtful pastors, at least, sometimes entertain the thought. Plainly, then, the time has come for looking the question squarely in the face, whether we are able to answer it to the conviction of all or not.

Why does the question come up? What's the matter with pastoral visiting that its utility or desirability is doubted? Is it a reflection upon the wisdom of the fathers who used it as, in their judgment, an indispensable part of their work as pastors of the flock? Not at all. One must be dull or narrow-minded who cannot appreciate the immense value of pastoral visiting to pastor and people, as the conditions of society once permitted it to be done. Suspicion as to its value to-day is something slowly generating

in the popular Christian consciousness, out of the conviction that circumstances of society have so greatly changed as materially to alter the case.

Changed conditions call for readjustment. The real question is, Can pastoral visiting be readjusted to the changed conditions which affect the relations of pastor and people? Is the principle in the old custom flexible enough to work profitably to the life of the Church in the conditions which rule to-day?

A moment's thought about two only of these changed conditions will clear the way to a rational conclusion. The most significant of all is the reduced official importance of the minister. The minister used to be a man plus an indefinable something, which made men respect, and women revere, and children fear him. The office carried with it an authority which it was rash in any well-ordered community to question. Now, whether for better or worse, he has been shorn of the plus part of his equipment for influence. He is reduced to the ranks of a common manhood.

An immediate result of this loss of official dignity is a reduced opportunity for usefulness in his pastoral visiting. Once the minister's coming meant the summoning of the family together, husband and children and servants, for a religious service—catechism, or reading of the Scriptures, personal conversation and prayer. Such a service was of consequence; it was the pastor's golden opportunity. But now the husband is at his business, the children are at school, the servants are of another faith, and the pastor sees only the mother and perhaps the grown-up daughters. How lessened the opportunity for spiritual labor, and how increased the temptation for merely social visiting, every faithful pastor must painfully appreciate.

The loss by the minister of the special authority which once warranted his pastoral oversight of the homes of his congregation has been step by step attended by a loss of special protection, while at pastoral work, from the misinterpretation of his motives by other men. A gentleman, not a pastor, who should make a practice of calling upon the wives of other men in their absence, would be properly regarded as wicked or weak. That society does not regard ministers as wicked is a tribute to the practically unimpeachable morals of the profession; but many a pastor is sensitive to a feeling strong among men that it is not quite manly or dignified to be the ladies' man he is seemingly compelled, by circumstance, to be.

Another of the changed conditions of society affecting the pastoral half of the minister's duties is in the remarkably multiplied and diversified activities of the intellectual life. The age is singular in the liberty and inducements it offers men of intellectual power and training to enter callings once supposed to be beneath the dignity of such men. Many trades have blossomed into professions, and technical schools, which compete with the universities for the bright young graduates of the high schools, are turning out hundreds of men every year highly educated in these practical professions. The intelligence of the hand labor classes is being quickened as never before; and from the laboratories of great original investigators, down to the humblest shops where mechanics at the bench mull over great scientific, social, and industrial questions, the call comes to the spiritual teacher of to-day to prepare to meet quick-witted, earnest men in discussion of a thousand questions they are asking Christianity.

The minister who is alert to bring the principles of Christ to bear upon living questions, to apply the divine force in Christ to the world's life at those points where its need of redemption is most apparent and pressing, cannot afford to spend his time in small talk with the women of his congregation. They, with their husbands and sons out in the imminent peril, and supremely needing a wise, manly, Christian brother in their pastor, ought to be the last ones to exact of their minister that he shall spend his precious time and strength—and this theirs as much as his—making pastoral calls of the conventional sort upon them.

Are these, then, reasons why pastoral visiting must go? By no means. The principle inside the custom of pastoral visiting, which ever justified the custom, is an essential principle in the pastoral relation. The pastor must come into touch with his people, personally and privately, as well as preach to them. He cannot preach to them with best results unless he knows them thus. But where shall he find his people, that he may come into this touch with them? He must go where they are, and must go most and oftenest where such of his people are as need him most—in their places of work and business, in their public assemblies, on the street—wherever he can find them. He will do no less pastoral visiting; but he will do what he does more wisely, and with regard to the changed conditions of society and modern life.

But shall the women not have their share of the pastor's attention? Certainly. But

what their share is must still be determined in view of the considerations which have been urged.

It is the writer's habit to try to see the inside of the homes of his people once a year. By making it the business of every pleasant afternoon, he is able to make the circuit of his parish within the three months following vacation. In this calling, at the homes and upon the ladies, he is always accompanied by his wife. The advantages of this are too apparent to need emphasis. When this visitation is concluded, he has the map of his parish freshly corrected in his memory, and knows, by recent observation, the spiritual and other conditions of all his people. This is the best possible preparation for the year's work, besides leaving him free for those pastoral labors which have been indicated as even more important for the spiritual guide of men to-day. During the rest of the year he has office hours and reception evenings, when the people are urged to seek him if they need him for any purpose. And, in addition to all this, he causes it to be distinctly understood that, if his people will excuse him from conventional pastoral calling during the remaining nine months of the year, he will be at the call of any one who needs him and will tell him so, at any time of the day or night. He will go from study or from sleep, from meals or from anything, if by going he can minister to any real need of any member of his congregation.

Pastoral visiting need not go. The principle in it is vital and flexible enough to adjust itself to any set of conditions yet arisen, or likely to arise, in society.

THE ARTICLES OF THE FAITH AS REVISED BY THE COMMITTEE.*

I.

Of God.

WE believe in and adore one living and true God, who is spirit and the Father of spirits, present in every place, personal, infinite, and eternal, the almighty Author and sovereign Lord of all; most blessed, most holy, and most free; perfect in wisdom, justice, truth, and love; to us most merciful and gracious; unto Whom only we must cleave, Whom only we must worship and obey. To Him be glory forever! Amen.

* We reprint from *The New York Evangelist* of October 31st, 1889, the new creed of the Presbyterian Church of England. —
Ed.

II.

Of the Trinity.

We acknowledge, with the ancient Church, the mystery of the Holy Trinity as revealed in Scripture, and believe that in the unity of the ever-blessed Godhead there are three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, of one substance, equal in power and glory.

III.

Of Creation.

We believe that Almighty God, for His own holy and loving ends, was pleased in the beginning to create the heavens and the earth, by the Son, the Eternal Word; and through progressive stages, to fashion and order this world, giving life to every creature; and to make man in His own image, that he might glorify and enjoy God, occupying and subduing the earth, and having dominion over the creatures, to the praise of his Maker's name.

IV.

Of Providence.

We believe that God the Creator upholds all things by the word of His power, preserving and providing for all His creatures, according to the laws of their being; and that He, through the presence and energy of His Spirit in nature and history, disposes and governs all events for His own high design; yet is He not in any wise the author or approver of sin, neither are the freedom and responsibility of man taken away, nor have any bounds been set to the sovereign liberty of Him who worketh when and where and how He pleaseth.

V.

Of the Fall.

We believe and confess that our first father, Adam, the representative head as well as common ancestor of mankind, transgressed the commandment of God through temptation of the devil, by which transgression he fell, and all mankind in him, from his original state of innocence and communion with God; and so all men have come under just condemnation, are subject to the penalty of death, and inherit a sinful nature, degenerate in every part, and estranged from God, from which proceed all actual transgressions: and we acknowledge that out of this condition no man is able to deliver himself.

VI.

Of Saving Grace.

We believe and proclaim that God, Who is rich in mercy as well as of perfect justice, was moved by His great love to man to hold forth from the first a promise of redemption, which from age to age He confirmed and unfolded, and that, in the fulness of the time, He accomplished His gracious purpose by sending His Son to be the Saviour of the world: wherefore our salvation out of sin and misery is ever to be ascribed to free and sovereign grace.

VII.

Of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We believe in and confess, with the ancient Church, the Lord Jesus Christ, Who, being the Eternal Son of God, became man by taking to Himself a true body and soul, yet without sin, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary; so that He is both God and Man, two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the divine and the human, being inseparably joined together in one person, that He might be the Mediator between God and man, by Whom alone we must be saved.

VIII.

Of the Work of Christ.

We believe that the Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ, being anointed with the Holy Spirit to proclaim and set up the Kingdom of God among men, did by His perfect life on earth, through words and deeds of grace, declare the Father, Whose image He is; and did fully satisfy divine justice, and obtain for us forgiveness of sins, reconciliation to God, and the gift of eternal life, through His obedience on our behalf to the law and will of His Father, even unto the death of the cross, wherein, bearing our sins, He offered Himself up a sacrifice without spot to God.

IX.

Of the Exaltation of Christ.

We believe that Jesus Christ, being for our offences crucified, dead, and buried, saw no corruption, but was raised again on the third day, in Whose risen life we live anew, and have the pledge of a blessed resurrection; that in the same body in which He rose, He ascended into heaven, where, as our High Priest, He maketh continual in-

tercession for us; and that He sitteth at the right hand of God, Head of the Church, clothed with authority and power as Lord over all.

X.

Of the Gospel.

We hold fast and proclaim that God, Who willeth that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth, has, by His Son our Saviour, given commission to the Church to preach unto all nations the Gospel of His grace, wherein He freely offers to all men forgiveness and eternal life, calling on them to turn from sin, and to receive and rest by faith upon the Lord Jesus Christ.

XI.

Of the Holy Spirit.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Giver of life, Who worketh freely as He will, without Whose gracious influence there is no salvation, and Whom the Father never withholdeth from any who ask for Him; and we give thanks that He has in every age moved on the hearts of men; that He spake by the prophets; that through our exalted Saviour He was sent forth in power to convict the world of sin, to enlighten the minds of men in the knowledge of Christ, and to persuade and enable them to obey the call of the Gospel; and that He abides with the Church, dwelling in every believer as the Spirit of truth, of holiness, and of comfort.

XII.

Of Election and Regeneration.

We humbly own and believe that God the Father, before the foundation of the world, was pleased of His sovereign grace to choose a people unto Himself in Christ, whom He gave to the Son, and to whom the Holy Spirit imparts spiritual life by a secret and wonderful operation of His power, using as His ordinary means, where years of understanding have been reached, the truths of His Word in ways agreeable to the nature of man; so that, being born from above, they are the children of God, created in Christ Jesus unto good works.

XIII.

Of Justification by Faith.

We believe that every one, who through the quickening grace of the Holy Spirit repents and believes the Gospel, confessing

and forsaking his sins; and humbly relying upon Christ alone for salvation, is freely pardoned and accepted as righteous in the sight of God, solely on the ground of Christ's perfect obedience and atoning sacrifice.

XIV.

Of Sonship in Christ.

We believe that those who receive Christ by faith are vitally united to Him, and become partakers in all the benefits of His redemption; that they are adopted into the family of God; and that they have the Spirit of His Son abiding in them, the earnest of their inheritance.

XV.

Of the Law of the New Obedience.

We believe and acknowledge that the Lord Jesus Christ has laid His people by His grace under new obligation to keep the perfect Law of God; and that by precept and example He has enlarged our knowledge of that Law, and illustrated the spirit of filial love in which the divine will is to be obeyed.

XVI.

Of Christian Perseverance.

We bless God that the obedience of Christians, though in this life always imperfect, is yet accepted for Christ's sake and pleasing to God, being the fruit of union to Christ and the evidence of a living faith; and that in measure as they surrender themselves to His Spirit and follow the guidance of His Word, they receive strength for daily service, and grow in holiness after the image of their Lord; or if, through unwatchfulness and neglect of prayer, any of them fall into grievous sin, yet by the mercy of God who abideth faithful they are not cast off, but are chastened for their backsliding, and through repentance restored to His favor, so that they perish not.

XVII.

Of the Church.

We acknowledge one holy catholic Church, the innumerable company of saints of every age and nation, who, being united by the Holy Spirit to Christ their Head, are one body in Him, and have communion with their Lord and with one another: further, we receive it as the will of Christ that His Church on earth should exist as a visible and sacred brotherhood, organized for the confession of His name, the public worship

of God, the upbuilding of the saints, and the proclamation of the Gospel; and we acknowledge, as a part, more or less pure, of this universal brotherhood, every particular Church throughout the world which professes faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, as Divine Lord and Saviour.

XVIII.

Of Church Order and Fellowship.

We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ, the sole Head of His Church, has appointed its worship, teaching, discipline, and government to be administered, according to His will revealed in Holy Scripture, by officers chosen for their fitness, and duly set apart to their office; and although the visible Church, even in its purest branch, may contain unworthy members, and is liable to err, yet believers ought not lightly to separate themselves from its communion, but are to live in fellowship with their brethren: which fellowship is to be extended, as God gives opportunity, to all who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.

XIX.

Of Holy Scripture.

We believe that God, who manifests Himself in creation and providence, and especially in the spirit of man, has been pleased to reveal His mind and will for our salvation at successive periods and in various ways; and that this Revelation has been, so far as needful, committed to writing by men inspired of the Holy Spirit, so that the Word of God is now contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which are therefore to be devoutly studied by all: and we reverently acknowledge the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures to be the Supreme Judge in questions of faith and duty.

XX.

Of the Sacraments.

We acknowledge Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the two Sacraments instituted by Christ, to be of perpetual obligation, as signs and seals of the new covenant, ratified in His precious blood; through the observance of which His Church is to confess her Lord and to be visibly distinguished from the rest of the world: Baptism with water into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost being the sacrament of admission into the visible Church, in which are set forth our union to Christ and regen-

eration by the Spirit, the remission of our sins, and our engagement to be the Lord's; and the Lord's Supper, the sacrament of communion with Christ and with His people, in which bread and wine are given and received in thankful remembrance of Him and of His sacrifice on the Cross, and in which they who in faith receive the same do, after a spiritual manner, partake of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, to their comfort, nourishment, and growth in grace.

XXI.

Of the Second Advent.

We assuredly believe that on a day known only to God, the Lord Jesus Christ will suddenly come again from heaven with power and great glory; and we look for this second appearing of our Saviour as the blessed hope of His Church, for which we ought always to wait in sober watchfulness and diligence, that we may be found ready at His coming.

XXII.

Of the Resurrection.

We believe that the souls of the righteous enter at death upon a state of rest and felicity at home with the Lord; and we look for the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust, through the power of the Son of God, when the bodies of all who are fallen asleep in Christ, as well as of the faithful who are then alive, shall be fashioned anew and conformed to the body of His glory.

XXIII.

Of the Last Judgment.

We believe that God will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ, before whom all men must appear, who shall separate the righteous from the wicked, make manifest the secrets of the heart, and render to every man according to the deeds which he hath done in the body, whether good or evil, when the wicked shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life.

XXIV.

Of the Life Everlasting.

Finally, we believe in and desire the life everlasting in which the redeemed shall receive their inheritance of glory in the kingdom of their Father, and be made fully blessed in the presence and service of God, Whom they shall see and enjoy forever and ever. Amen.

DECLARATORY STATEMENT.

Whereas this Church has ever acknowledged the canonical books of Holy Scripture to be her sole, Supreme Standard, to which the Westminster Confession of Faith is to be regarded as subordinate ;

Whereas every endeavor to set forth in the form of a Creed the truth taught in Holy Scripture, must be at the best imperfect ; and

Whereas every such Creed is liable to become less adequate to express the Church's faith, through that fuller and clearer apprehension of His revealed truth which it pleases God from time to time to grant unto His Church ;

Therefore it has seemed good and needful to this Church in Synod assembled, for the better exhibition of her belief on certain points, to declare as follows :

I.

That the doctrine of Redemption set forth in the Westminster Confession, particularly in its reference to the election of some among mankind to eternal life, is held and taught in this Church, together with other great truths which are vital to the Gospel, such as

1, That the love of God to mankind moved Him to provide, by the gift of His Son to be a propitiation for the whole world, a way of salvation which in His Gospel is freely offered to all ;

2, That God has no pleasure in the death of any sinner, but desires that all should repent and live ; and

3, That every man who hears the Gospel is responsible for his acceptance or rejection of its free offer of eternal life.

II.

That the teaching of the Confession on the subject of man's total depravity since the Fall, is not to be understood as denying his responsibility both under the Law and under the Gospel, or the existence and value of the natural virtues.

III.

That while the duty of proclaiming the Gospel to all men is clear and imperative, and while the proclamation of the Gospel is the ordinary means of salvation for all who are capable of being called thereby ; and while it is certain that no one is saved except through the mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the working of the Holy Spirit : Yet it does not follow, nor is it re-

quired to be held, either that any who die in infancy are lost, or that God may not extend His mercy to those who are beyond the reach of the ordinary means of salvation, as it may seem good in His sight.

IV.

That with reference to the teaching of the Confession regarding the duty of Civil Rulers, this Church, while holding that such rulers are subject in their own province to the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, does not accept anything in that document which favors, or may be regarded as favoring, intolerance or persecution.

V.

That liberty of opinion is recognized in this Church on such points of the Confession as do not enter into the substance of the Faith : the Church retaining full authority to determine in any case which may arise what points fall within this description, as well as to guard against any abuse of this liberty to the injury of her unity and peace.

THE CORRESPONDENCE UNIVERSITY.*

From *The Christian Herald* (Baptist), Detroit, Mich., Nov. 23, 1890.

ARTICLES having appeared in the *Herald* concerning Correspondence University, the president asks that the other side have a hearing, and sends the following letter :

"I desire to set you right about the matter, and to request that this letter be published in your next issue as evidence that your publications have not been dictated by malice, or unchristian animus. Allow me to submit the enclosed proofs of the falsity of the charges that have been made, which are extracts from our recent publications, and to make the following observations : The origin of the press attacks was mainly due to a misunderstanding. A gentleman who has since become one of our professors addressed an inquiry concerning the University which got into the hands of a reporter whose investigation was confined to the city directory. On the supposition that our original officials were all residents of Chicago, and finding that persons of somewhat similar

* Having reprinted from *The Christian Herald* in our November number (p. 90), an article entitled "Honorary (?) Degrees," in which the Correspondence University comes in for complimentary mention, we think it only fair to reprint the reply made by the president of that institution.—Ed.

names (though in all cases with initials more or less different) were given in the directory as men of inferior occupations, he at once made this the basis of a newspaper sensation similar to one that had had perhaps, some foundation, and which had been made a few weeks before concerning another institution. Later, this publication led to some feeling, and a garbled report of an interview with me was published, the true character of which may be seen from the fact that my reply, after its acceptance, was later suppressed, but a promise given that the mistake should not be repeated.

"The publication gave rise, in some cases, to honest misapprehension, and in other cases to attacks that were criminally outrageous, certain religious newspapers having grossly falsified, one in particular going so far as to assert that its editor had himself seen circulars of this University representing Albert G. Harkness, of Madison University, as its president, and refusing to make or allow us to make a correction, thus forcing me to denounce it in a circular letter to over one thousand newspapers of the United States. The fact is that there is absolutely no foundation for a single charge.

"With a legal charter and a full Board of Directors, a present corps of full professors numbering thirty-eight, exclusive of all Associate professors, but including many eminent professors of colleges and some fifteen clergymen, it hardly seems necessary to meet all the slurs and misrepresentations that have been made; but I will add that no professor's name has ever been used without authority or even retained in our circulars after his resignation has been accepted, even though at great cost, as was sometimes the case. So far, not a single graduate has been shown to be unworthy, which the very fact that our graduates are mainly post-graduates of the best colleges in the land and are often clergymen of city churches would substantiate.

"As for myself, I claim to have managed the University over five years without criticism, to have been indebted to no one for a single, essential feature, and to have brought it to a point when with its new organization it promises to have over 500 students before the present year is over and to carry on a work which meets the approval of every person who fully investigates it, and which will be truly national in its extent and character. The tuition has been reduced, elaborate courses of study, as extensive as those of any American college or university, have been adopted, and hundreds of devoted friends may be counted in all the States of the

Union. We now propose to erect a building (for which I have myself agreed to give \$5,000) and to develop in this country the University Extension System of England.

"I am glad of your attack on honorary degrees, but acknowledge no one more earnestly opposed to it than myself.

"Finally, it should be stated that Chautauqua University does grant 'degrees conferred by Harvard and Yale and our leading theological seminaries' and not mere certificates. We have been pioneers, but we shall soon have many followers. Trusting that you will do this simple justice and thus remedy somewhat the wrong done, I am very truly yours,

"F. W. HARKINS, President."

AGNOSTICISM.

A REPLY TO PROFESSOR HUXLEY.

BY HENRY WACE, D.D.

(Continued from the December number, p. 179.)

It had "the advantage" again, of being "offensive to the persons attacked," when Professor Huxley, in an article in this review on "Science and the Bishops," in November, 1887, said that "scientific ethics can and does declare that the profession of belief" in such narratives as that of the devils entering a herd of swine, or of the fig-tree that was blasted for bearing no figs, upon the evidence on which multitudes of Christians believe it, "is immoral;" and the observation which followed, that "theological apologists would do well to consider the fact that, in the matter of intellectual veracity, Science is already a long way ahead of the churches," has the same "advantage." I repeat that I cannot but treat Professor Huxley as an example of the more refined sort of controversialist; it must be supposed, therefore, that when he speaks of observations or insinuations which are somewhat offensive to the "persons attacked" being dear to the other sort of controversialist, he is unconscious of his own methods of controversy—or, shall I say, his own temptations?

But I desire as far as possible to avoid any rivalry with Professor Huxley in these refinements—more or less—of controversy; and am, in fact, forced by pressure both of space and of time to keep as rigidly as possible to the points directly at issue. He proceeds to restate the case as follows: "The agnostic says, 'I cannot find good evidence that

so and so is true.' 'Ah,' says his adversary, seizing his opportunity, 'then you declare that Jesus Christ was untruthful, for he said so and so'—a very telling method of rousing prejudice." Now that superior scientific veracity to which, as we have seen, Professor Huxley lays claim, should have prevented him putting such vulgar words into my mouth. There is not a word in my paper to charge agnostics with declaring that Jesus Christ was "untruthful." I believe it impossible in these days for any man who claims attention—I might say, for any man—to declare our Lord untruthful. What I said, and what I repeat, is that the position of an agnostic involves the conclusion that Jesus Christ was under an "illusion". in respect to the deepest beliefs of his life and teaching. The words of my paper are, "An agnosticism which knows nothing of the relation of man to God must not only refuse belief to our Lord's most undoubted teaching, but must deny the reality of the spiritual convictions in which he lived and died." The point is this—that there can, at least, be no reasonable doubt that Jesus Christ lived, and taught, and died, in the belief of certain great principles respecting the existence of God, our relation to God, and his own relation to us, which an agnostic says are beyond the possibilities of human knowledge; and of course an agnostic regards Jesus Christ as a man. If so, he must necessarily regard Jesus Christ as mistaken, since the notion of his being untruthful is a supposition which I could not conceive being suggested. The question I have put is not, as Professor Huxley represents, what is the most unpleasant alternative to belief in the primary truths of the Christian religion, but what is the least unpleasant; and all I have maintained is that the least unpleasant alternative necessarily involved is, that Jesus Christ was under an illusion in his most vital convictions.

I content myself with thus rectifying the state of the case, without making the comments which I think would be justified on such a crude misrepresentation of my argument. But Professor Huxley goes on to observe that "the value of the evidence as to what Jesus may have said and done, and as to the exact nature and scope of his authority, is just that which the agnostic finds it most difficult to determine." Undoubtedly, that is a primary question; but who would suppose from Professor Huxley's statement of the case that the argument of the paper he is attacking proceeded to deal with this very point, and that he has totally ignored the chief consideration it alleged? Almost

immediately after the words Professor Huxley has quoted, the following passage occurs, which I must needs transfer to these pages, as containing the central point of the argument: "It may be asked how far we can rely on the accounts we possess of our Lord's teaching on these subjects. Now it is unnecessary for the general argument before us to enter on those questions respecting the authenticity of the gospel narratives, which ought to be regarded as settled by M. Renan's practical surrender of the adverse case. *Apart from all disputed points of criticism, no one practically doubts that our Lord lived, and that he died on the cross, in the most intense sense of filial relation to his Father in heaven, and that he bore testimony to that Father's providence, love, and grace toward mankind. The Lord's Prayer affords sufficient evidence upon these points. If the Sermon on the Mount alone be added, the whole unseen world, of which the agnostic refuses to know anything, stands unveiled before us. There you see revealed the divine Father and Creator of all things, in personal relation to his creatures, hearing their prayers, witnessing their actions, caring for them and rewarding them. There you hear of a future judgment administered by Christ himself, and of a heaven to be hereafter revealed, in which those who live as the children of that Father, and who suffer in the cause and for the sake of Christ himself, will be abundantly rewarded. If Jesus Christ preached that sermon, made those promises, and taught that prayer, then any one who says that we know nothing of God, or of a future life, or of an unseen world, says that he does not believe Jesus Christ.*"

Professor Huxley has not one word to say upon this argument, though the whole case is involved in it. Let us take as an example the illustration he proceeds to give. "If," he says, "I venture to doubt that the Duke of Wellington gave the command, 'Up, Guards, and at 'em!' at Waterloo, I do not think that even Dr. Wace would accuse me of disbelieving the duke." Certainly not. But if Professor Huxley were to maintain that the pursuit of glory was the true motive of the soldier, and that it was an illusion to suppose that simple devotion to duty could be the supreme guide of military life, I should certainly charge him with contradicting the duke's teaching and disregarding his authority and example. A hundred stories like that of "Up, Guards, and at 'em!" might be doubted, or positively disproved, and it would still remain a fact beyond all reasonable doubt that the Duke of

Wellington was essentially characterized by the sternest and most devoted sense of duty, and that he had inculcated duty as the very watchword of a soldier; and even Professor Huxley would not suggest that Lord Tennyson's ode, which has embodied this characteristic in immortal verse, was an unfounded poetical romance.

The main question at issue, in a word, is one which Professor Huxley has chosen to leave entirely on one side—whether, namely, allowing for the utmost uncertainty on other points of the criticism to which he appeals, there is any reasonable doubt that the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount afford a true account of our Lord's essential belief and cardinal teaching. If they do—then I am not now contending that they involve the whole of the Christian creed; I am not arguing, as Professor Huxley would represent, that he ought for that reason alone to be a Christian—I simply represent that, as an agnostic, he must regard those beliefs and that teaching as mistaken—the result of an illusion, to say the least. I am not going, therefore, to follow Professor Huxley's example and go down a steep place with the Gadarene swine into a sea of uncertainties and possibilities, and stake the whole case of Christian belief as against agnosticism upon one of the most difficult and mysterious narratives in the New Testament. I will state my position on that question presently. But I am first and chiefly concerned to point out that Professor Huxley has skillfully evaded the very point and edge of the argument he had to meet. Let him raise what difficulties he pleases, with the help of his favorite critics, about the Gadarene swine, or even about all the stories of demoniacs. He will find that his critics—and even critics more rationalistic than they—fail him when it comes to the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount, and, I will add, the story of the Passion. He will find, or rather he must have found, that the very critics he relies upon recognize that in the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer, allowing for variations in form and order, the substance of our Lord's essential teaching is preserved. On a point which, until Professor Huxley shows cause to the contrary, can hardly want argument, the judgment of the most recent of his witnesses may suffice—Professor Reuss, of Strasburg. In Professor Huxley's article on the "Evolution of Theology" in the number of this review for March, 1886, he says, "As Reuss appears to me to be one of the most learned, acute, and fair-minded of those whose works I have studied, I have made most use of the

commentary and dissertations in his splendid French edition of the Bible." What, then, is the opinion of the critic for whom Professor Huxley has this regard? In the volume of his work which treats of the first three Gospels, Reuss says at page 191–92. "If anywhere the tradition which has preserved to us the reminiscences of the life of Jesus upon earth carries with it certainty and the evidence of its fidelity, it is here," and again: "In short, it must be acknowledged that the redactor, in thus concentrating the substance of the moral teaching of the Lord, has rendered a real service to the religious study of this portion of the tradition, and the reserves which historical criticism has a right to make with respect to the form will in no way diminish this advantage." It will be observed that Professor Reuss thinks, as many good critics have thought, that the Sermon on the Mount combines various distinct utterances of our Lord, but he none the less recognizes that it embodies an unquestionable account of the substance of our Lord's teaching.

But it is surely superfluous to argue either this particular point, or the main conclusion which I have founded on it. Can there be any doubt whatever, in the mind of any reasonable man, that Jesus Christ had beliefs respecting God which an agnostic alleges there is no sufficient ground for? We know something at all events of what his disciples taught; we have authentic original documents, unquestioned by any of Professor Huxley's authorities, as to what St. Paul taught and believed, and of what he taught and believed respecting his Master's teaching; and the central point of this teaching is a direct assertion of knowledge and revelation as against the very agnosticism from which Professor Huxley manufactured that designation. "As I passed by," said St. Paul at Athens, "I found an altar with this inscription: 'To the unknown God.' Whom therefore ye ignorantly—or in agnosticism—worship, Him I declare unto you." An agnostic withholds his assent from this primary article of the Christian creed; and though Professor Huxley, in spite of the lack of information he alleges respecting early Christian teaching, knows enough on the subject to have a firm belief "that the Nazarenes, say of the year 40," headed by James, would have stoned any one who propounded the Nicene Creed to them, he will hardly contend that they denied that article, or doubted that Jesus Christ believed it. Let us again listen to the authority to whom Professor Huxley himself refers. Reuss says at page 4 of the work already quoted:

Historical literature in the primitive church attaches itself in the most immediate manner to the reminiscences collected by the apostles and their friends, directly after their separation from their Master. The need of such a return to the past arose naturally from the profound impression which had been made upon them by the teaching, and still more by the individuality itself of Jesus, and on which both their hopes for the future and their convictions were founded. . . . It is in these facts, in this continuity of a tradition which could not but go back to the very morrow of the tragic scene of Golgotha that we have a strong guarantee for its authenticity. . . . We have direct historical proof that the thread of tradition was not interrupted. Not only does one of our evangelists furnish this truth in formal terms (Luke i. 2); but in many other places besides we perceive the idea, or the point of view, that all which the apostles know, think, and teach, is at bottom and essentially a reminiscence—a reflection of what they have seen and learned at another time, a reproduction of lessons and impressions received.

Now let it be allowed for argument's sake that the belief and teaching of the apostles are distinct from those of subsequent Christianity, yet it is surely a mere paradox to maintain that they did not assert, as taught by their Master, truths which an agnostic denies. They certainly spoke, as Paul did, of the love of God; they certainly spoke, as Paul did, of Jesus having been raised from the dead by God the Father (Gal. i. 1); they certainly spoke, as Paul did, of Jesus Christ returning to judge the world; they certainly spoke, as Paul did, of "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. xi. 31). That they could have done this without Jesus Christ having taught God's love, or having said that God was his Father, or having declared that he would judge the world, is a supposition which will certainly be regarded by an overwhelming majority of reasonable men as a mere paradox; and I cannot conceive, until he says so, that Professor Huxley would maintain it. But if so, then all Professor Huxley's argumentation about the Gadarene swine is mere irrelevance to the argument he undertakes to answer. The Gospels might be obliterated as evidence to-morrow, and it would remain indisputable that Jesus Christ taught certain truths respecting God, and man's relation to God, from which an agnostic withholds his assent. If so, he does not believe Jesus Christ's teaching; he is so far an unbeliever, and "unbeliever," Dr. Johnson says, is an equivalent of "infidel."

This consideration will indicate another irrelevance in Professor Huxley's argument. He asks for a definition of what a Christian is, before he will allow that he can be justly called an infidel. But without being able to give an accurate definition of a crayfish,

which perhaps only Professor Huxley could do, I may be very well able to say that some creatures are not crayfish; and it is not necessary to frame a definition of a Christian in order to say confidently that a person who does not believe the broad and unquestionable elements of Christ's teachings and convictions is not a Christian. "Infidel" or "unbeliever" is, of course, as Professor Huxley says, a relative and not a positive term. He makes a great deal of play out what he seems to suppose will be a very painful and surprising consideration to myself, that to a Mohammedan I am an infidel. Of course I am; and I should never expect a Mohammedan, if he were called upon, as I was, to argue before an assembly of his own fellow-believers, to call me anything else. Professor Huxley is good enough to imagine me in his company on a visit to the Hazar Mosque at Cairo. When he entered that mosque without due credentials, he suspects that, had he understood Arabic, "dog of an infidel" would have been by no means the most "unpleasant" of the epithets showered upon him, before he could explain and apologize for the mistake. If, he says, "I had had the pleasure of Dr. Wace's company on that occasion, the indiscriminate followers of the Prophet, would, I am afraid, have made no difference between us; not even if they had known that he was the head of an orthodox Christian seminary." Probably not; and I will add that I should have felt very little confidence in any attempts which Professor Huxley might have made, in the style of his present article, to protect me, by repudiating for himself the unpleasant epithets which he deprecates. It would, I suspect, have been of very little avail to attempt a subtle explanation, to one of the learned mollahs of whom he speaks, that he really did not mean to deny that there was one God, but only that he did not know anything on the subject, and that he desired to avoid expressing any opinion respecting the claims of Mohammed. It would be plain to the learned mollah that Professor Huxley did not believe either of the articles of the Mohammedan creed—in other words that, for all his fine distinctions, he was at bottom a downright infidel, such as I confessed myself, and that there was an end of the matter. There is no fair way of avoiding the plain matter of fact in either case. A Mohammedan believes and asserts that there is no God but God, and that Mohammed is the prophet of God. I don't believe Mohammed. In the plain, blunt, sensible phrase people used to use on such subjects I believe he was a false proph-

et, and I am a downright infidel about him. The Christian creed might almost be summed up in the assertion that there is one, and but one God, and that Jesus Christ is his prophet; and whoever denies that creed says that he does not believe Jesus Christ, by whom it was undoubtedly asserted. It is better to look facts in the face, especially from a scientific point of view. Whether Professor Huxley is justified in his denial of that creed is a further question, which demands separate consideration, but which was not, and is not now, at issue. All I say is that his position involves that disbelief or infidelity, and that this is a responsibility which must be faced by agnosticism.

But I am forced to conclude that Professor Huxley cannot have taken the pains to understand the point I raised, not only by the irrelevance of his argument on these considerations, but by a misquotation which the superior accuracy of a man of science ought to have rendered impossible. Twice over in the article he quotes me as saying that "it is, and it ought to be, an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe in Jesus Christ." As he winds up his attack upon my paper by bringing against this statement his rather favorite charge of "immorality"—and even "most profound immorality"—he was the more bound to accuracy in his quotation of my words. But neither in the official report of the congress to which he refers, nor in any report that I have seen, is this the statement attributed to me. What I said, and what I meant to say, was that it ought to be an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly "that he does not believe Jesus Christ." By inserting the little word "in," Professor Huxley has, by an unconscious ingenuity, shifted the import of the statement. He goes on to denounce "the pestilent doctrine on which all the churches have insisted, that honest disbelief in their more or less astonishing creeds is a moral offence, indeed a sin of the deepest dye."* His interpretation exhibits, in fact, the idea in his own mind, which he has doubtless conveyed to his readers, that I said it ought to be unpleasant to a man to have to say that he does not believe in the Christian creed. I certainly think it ought, for reasons I will mention; but that is not what I said. I spoke, deliberately, not of the Christian creed as a whole, but of Jesus Christ as a person, and regarded as a witness to certain primary truths which an agnostic will not acknowledge. It was a per-

sonal consideration to which I appealed, and not a dogmatic one; and I am sorry, for that reason, that Professor Huxley will not allow me to leave it in the reserve with which I hoped it had been sufficiently indicated. I said that "no criticism worth mentioning doubts the story of the Passion; and that story involves the most solemn attestation, again and again, of truths of which an agnostic coolly says he knows nothing. An agnosticism which knows nothing of the relation of man to God must not only refuse belief to our Lord's most undoubted teaching, but must deny the reality of the spiritual convictions in which he lived and died. It must declare that his most intimate, most intense beliefs, and his dying aspirations were an illusion. Is that supposition tolerable?" I do not think this deserves to be called "a proposition of the most profoundly immoral character." I think it ought to be unpleasant, and I am sure it always will be unpleasant, for a man to listen to the Saviour on the cross uttering such words as "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," and to say that they are not to be trusted as revealing a real relation between the Saviour and God. In spite of all doubts as to the accuracy of the Gospels, Jesus Christ—I trust I may be forgiven, under the stress of controversy, for mentioning his sacred name in this too familiar manner—is a tender and sacred figure to all thoughtful minds, and it is, it ought to be, and it always will be, a very painful thing, to say that he lived and died under a mistake in respect to the words which were first and last on his lips. I think, as I have admitted, that it should be unpleasant for a man who has as much appreciation of Christianity, and of its work in the world, as Professor Huxley sometimes shows, to have to say that its belief was founded on no objective reality. The unpleasantness, however, of denying one system of thought may be balanced by the pleasantness, as Professor Huxley suggests, of asserting another and a better one. But nothing, to all time, can do away with the unpleasantness, not only of repudiating sympathy with the most sacred figure of humanity in his deepest beliefs and feelings, but of pronouncing him under an illusion in his last agony. If it be the truth, let it by all means be said; but if we are to talk of "immorality" in such matters, I think there must be a lack of moral sensibility in any man who could say it without pain.

The plain fact is that this misquotation would have been as impossible as a good deal else of Professor Huxley's argument;

had he, in any degree, appreciated the real strength of the hold which Christianity has over men's hearts and minds. The strength of the Christian Church, in spite of its faults, errors, and omissions, is not in its creed, but in its Lord and Master. In spite of all the critics, the Gospels have conveyed to the minds of millions of men a living image of Christ. They see him there; they hear his voice; they listen, and they believe him. It is not so much that they accept certain doctrines as taught by him, as that they accept him, himself, as their Lord and their God. The sacred fire of trust in him descended upon the apostles, and has from them been handed on from generation to generation. It is with that living personal figure that agnosticism has to deal; and as long as the Gospels practically produce the effect of making that figure a reality to human hearts, so long will the Christian faith, and the Christian Church, in their main characteristics, be vital and permanent forces in the world. Professor Huxley tells us, in a melancholy passage, that he cannot define "the grand figure of Jesus." Who shall dare to "define" it? But saints have both written and lived an *imitatio Christi*, and men and women can feel and know what they cannot define. Professor Huxley, it would seem, would have us all wait coolly until we have solved all critical difficulties, before acting on such a belief. "Because," he says, "we are often obliged, by the pressure of events, to act on very bad evidence, it does not follow that it is proper to act on such evidence when the pressure is absent." Certainly not; but it is strange ignorance of human nature for Professor Huxley to imagine that there is no "pressure" in this matter. It was a voice which understood the human heart better which said, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;" and the attraction of that voice outweighs many a critical difficulty under the pressure of the burdens and the sins of life.

Professor Huxley, indeed, admits, in one sentence of his article, the force of this influence on individuals.

If (he says) a man can find a friend, the hypothesis of all his hopes, the mirror of his ethical ideal, in the pages of any, or of all, of the Gospels, let him live by faith in that ideal. Who shall, or can, forbid him? But let him not delude himself with the notion that his faith is evidence of the objective reality of that in which he trusts. Such evidence is to be obtained only by the use of the methods of science, as applied to history and to literature, and it amounts at present to very little.

Well, a single man's belief in an ideal may be very little evidence of its objective reality.

But the conviction of millions of men, generation after generation, of the veracity of the four evangelical witnesses, and of the human and divine reality of the figure they describe, has at least something of the weight of the verdict of a jury. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*. Practically the figure of Christ lives. The Gospels have created it; and it subsists as a personal fact in life, alike among believers and unbelievers. Professor Huxley himself, in spite of all his scepticism, appears to have his own type of this character. The apologue of the woman taken in adultery might, he says, "if internal evidence were an infallible guide, well be affirmed to be a typical example of the teachings of Jesus." Internal evidence may not be an infallible guide; but it certainly carries great weight, and no one has relied more upon it in these questions than the critics whom Professor Huxley quotes.

But as I should be sorry to imitate Professor Huxley, on so momentous a subject, by evading the arguments and facts he alleges, I will consider the question of external evidence on which he dwells. I must repeat that the argument of my paper is independent of this controversy. The fact that our Lord taught and believed what agnostics ignore is not dependent on the criticism of the four Gospels. In addition to the general evidence to which I have alluded, there is a further consideration which Professor Huxley feels it necessary to mention, but which he evades by an extraordinary inconsequence. He alleges that the story of the Gadarene swine involves fabulous matter, and that this discredits the trustworthiness of the whole Gospel record. But he says:

At this point a very obvious objection arises and deserves full and candid consideration. It may be said that critical scepticism carried to the length suggested is historical pyrrhonism; that if we are to altogether discredit an ancient or a modern historian because he has assumed fabulous matter to be true, it will be as well to give up paying any attention to history. . . . Of course (he acknowledges) this is perfectly true. I am afraid there is no man alive whose witness could be accepted, if the condition precedent were proof that he had never invented and promulgated a myth.

The question, then, which Professor Huxley himself raises, and which he had to answer, was this: Why is the general evidence of the Gospels, on the main facts of our Lord's life and teaching, to be discredited, even if it be true that they have invented or promulgated a myth about the Gadarene swine?

(To be continued.)

GOODLY WORDS.

Original translations from MEISTER ECKHART, by C. H. A. Bjerregaard, Librarian, the Astor Library.

(Continued from page 180.)

(Mart. xxii.) Just in the proportion as a man denies himself by God's help and becomes united with God, he is more God than man. When man is entirely liberated from self and lives in God only, he becomes in *Grace* the selfsame which God is by Nature, and God recognizes that there is no difference between Himself and that man. I said in *Grace*. God is good by nature, but the man is good by grace.

(Mart. xxii.) God is ever and always active in the now of eternity. His activity is the bringing forth of His Son. Him He is bringing forth always. The Son is the Firstbegotten from the fruitfulness of the Divine nature, and this begetting is without any medium; therefore He is called the Image and the Word of the Father. In this Word God speaks my soul and thine. He brings forth His Son in the soul in the same way as in Eternity He brings Him forth, and in no other way. The Father brings forth His Son unceasingly; yea, I will say more still: He brings forth me as His son; yea, He brings forth me as His being and essence. Then I flow forth in the Holy Spirit; then there is one life, one being, and one work.

(Mart. xxii.) I do not thank God that He loves me, He cannot do otherwise, nor does He wish to do otherwise. I thank Him because it is impossible for Him to deny (go back on) His Godhead.

(Mart. xxiii.) When the Will is so united that it becomes a One in oneness, then does the Heavenly Father generate (*gebirt*) his only begotten Son in Himself and in me. Why in Himself and in me? Because I am one with Him; He cannot exclude me. From the selfsame act proceeds the Holy Ghost; hence from me, too. Why? I am in God. If the Holy Ghost derives not His being from me, too, He derives it not from God. I am in nowise excluded.

(Mart. xxiii.) God has not only become man, He has assumed human nature.

(Mart. xxiii.) It is the Father's Being to bring forth the Son; it is the Being of the Son to be born, and that I am brought forth in Him. It is the Being of the Holy Spirit that I be burned in Him and be melted to pure love.

(Mart. xxiv.) The Father brings forth His Son in the righteous man. All the virtue of a righteous man and all his good work is the bringing forth of the Son by the Father. The Father does not rest till His Son is born in me; He forces me to bear the Son. Wise people ought to know this, and common people must believe it.

(Mart. xxiv.) It is possible for me to attain to the highest unity which Christ ever had with the Father, if I could divest myself of individuality and put on the Universal Human.

(Mart. xxiv.) The Lord said: "All things that I heard from My Father I have made known unto you." All that the Father has and is, the abyss of His being and nature, He brings forth in His Son, the Onlybegotten; it is this the Son hears from the Father, and he has revealed to us, that *we* are this selfsame Son. God has become man, that I may become God. God has died, that I may die from the world and its things.

(Mart. xxv.) The righteous man serves neither God nor the creature; he is free.

(Mart. xxv.) A master has said: A soul loving God, loves Him because of Goodness. But I say

that Being is more worth than Goodness. Because were Being not, Goodness would be neither, and only as far as Goodness has Being in it, is it Goodness.

(Mart. xxv.) God has several names, but the greatest name is "Being." All that is weak and mortal is sinking away from Being. So far as our life is Being, so far it is in God. There is no life, be it ever so mean and poor, if you consider it Being, it is nobler than all, that ever was alive. If you consider a flower in its Being, it is nobler than the whole world.

(Mart. xxv.) The will may be satisfied with the Goodness of God, but the reason will find rest neither in Goodness, nor in Wisdom, nor in Truth, nor in God Himself, so long as He is God merely. She seeks God as the marrow from which Goodness flows; she wills God as the pith from which Goodness springs; she seeks God as the root from which Goodness sprouts; she goes down to the ground, from where Truth and Goodness proceed; she lays hold of them in the Beginning (*in principio*), before they can be named. She wills God only as He is in Himself, when Goodness and all names are laid aside. She is not satisfied with the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, but penetrates to the deepest deep, to the root, from which spring the Son and the Holy Spirit.

(Mart. xxv.) God's goodness does not insure my Salvation; neither would I ask God to save me for goodness' sake. Perhaps He wills not to save me. This is my Salvation that God is rational and that I know it.

(Mart. xxv.) All the Created is 'unfree. He alone is a righteous man who has put off all creation, because there is no truth in it.

(Mart. xxvi.) St. Paul said: "By the grace of God I am what I am." These words are true, and yet Grace was not in him. Grace had been at work, that Being might come. After Grace had done its work, Paul was as he was *originally*. In that state all difference between God and man disappears. Therefore do I ask God to liberate me from God, because *Being* is above and beyond God and all differences.

(Mart. xxvii.) When I rested in first principles, I had no God, I was my own self; I willed not; I asked for nothing; I was simply a being and knew myself in divine Truth. That which I willed, that I was; and that which I was, I willed, and I was free from God and all Thing. As soon as I left my Freedom and entered my created existence, I got a God—in the time before the creatures were, God was not God. He was as He was. When the creatures came forth and received their created existence, then God was no more God in Himself, but God in Creatures.

(Mart. xxviii.) So long as I remained in the Ground of the Deity, in the Abyss of the Deity, in the Source of the Deity, nobody asked about my volitions or my intentions. When I stepped out, I heard all creation talk about God.

Why did they talk about God and not about the Deity? In the Deity all is like unto itself, is one, and you can say nothing about it.

God and the Deity are not equivalent terms. God is active and creating. The Deity does nothing, but rests in itself, is still and immovable. When I return to the Deity, my transition is better than my exit, because I bring all creatures back with me in my Reason. When I shall have arrived in the Ground of the Deity, shall have come to the Source of the Deity, nobody will ask me whence I come, where I have been, and nobody shall have missed me. Here terminates all Becoming.

PARAGRAPHIC.

[Copy of President Washington's first Thanksgiving Proclamation. From *The Congregationalist*.]

BY THE
PRESIDENT
OF THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.
A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS it is the Duty of all Nations to acknowledge the Providence of Almighty God, to obey his Will, to be grateful for his Benefits, and humbly to implore his Protection and Favour: And whereas both houses of Congress have, by their joint Committee, requested me, "To recommend to the People of the UNITED STATES, a Day of PUBLIC THANKSGIVING and PRAYER, to be observed by acknowledging with grateful Hearts the many signal Favours of Almighty God, especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a Form of Government for their Safety and Happiness."

NOW THEREFORE, I do recommend and assign THURSDAY the TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF NOVEMBER next, to be devoted by the People of these States, to the Service of that great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent Author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be: That we may then all unite in rendering unto him our sincere and humble thanks for his kind Care and Protection of the People of this Country previous to their becoming a Nation;—for the signal and manifold Mercies, and the favourable Interpositions of his Providence in the Course & Conclusion of the late War;—for the great Degree of Tranquility, Union and Plenty, which we have since enjoyed;—for the peaceable and rational Manner in which we have been enabled to establish Constitutions of Government for our Safety and Happiness, and particularly the national one now lately instituted;—for the civil and religious Liberty with which we are blessed, and the means we have of acquiring and diffusing useful knowledge;—and in general, for all the great and various Favours which he hath been pleased to confer upon us.

AND ALSO, that we may then unite in most humbly offering our Prayers and Supplications to the great LORD and RULER of Nations, and beseech him to pardon our National and other Transgressions;—to enable us all, whether in public or private Stations, to perform our several and relative Duties properly and punctually;—to render our national Government a Blessing to all the people, by constantly being a Government of wise, just and Constitutional Laws, directly and faithfully executed and obeyed;—to protect and guide all Sovereigns and nations, (especially such as have shown kindness unto us) and to bless them with good Government, Peace and Concord;—to promote the Knowledge and Practice of true Religion and Virtue, and the increase of Science among them and us;—and generally to grant unto all Mankind such a Degree of temporal Prosperity as he alone knows to be best.

Given under my Hand, at the City of New York, the third Day of October, in the year of our Lord One Thousand, Seven hundred and eighty nine.

G. WASHINGTON.

THE Bishop of Peterborough must bestir himself or, as it seems, he will be left behind at the present rate of progress by his brother of Oxford. Bishop Stubbs has added to the conundrum which he propounded last spring when he asked, "Why he himself was like Homer," giving the reply, "Because

they had both suffered from translation." Finding that one of his officials was continually quoting the practice that prevailed during Bishop Wilberforce's reign, he addressed him thus: "Mr. Archdeacon, can you tell me why you are like the Witch of Endor?" When the posed functionary professed himself unable to give the answer, the bishop added, "Because you are continually endeavoring to raise the spirit of Samuel."—*The Churchman*, Nov. 2, 1889.

THE PROFESSORS IN THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.—The professors in the Divinity school of the great Roman Catholic University at Washington have all been appointed, and are all foreign born.

The chair of dogmatic theology has been given to the Rev. Dr. Schroeder, who comes from the university of Cologne. He has studied theology at Rome, and after a three-years' course in philosophy and a four-years' course in theology, was raised to priesthood in 1874. The member of the University who is to have control of the discipline of the students is Father Hogan. He was born in Ireland, was educated in Paris, and for thirty years taught in a Roman Catholic institution there. Some five years ago he came to this country. The professor in philosophy, the Rev. Dr. Pohle, was born in Germany, and educated in Rome and Würzburg. He has taught in Leeds, England, and Fulda, Germany, and from the latter place came to Washington. The lecturer in canon law is Father Messmer, born in Switzerland and educated at Innsbruck, the most Jesuitical of Jesuit colleges. Messmer has been in this country for some time. The professor in moral Theology is Professor Bouquillo, late at Lille. He was born and educated in Belgium. Biblical science is to be taught by the Rev. Dr. Hyvernaut, at present engaged in scientific studies in Egypt. He is a Frenchman. The Rev. Dr. Graf, a German by birth and a Frenchman by education and professional experience, is to direct the musical part of the curriculum.—*The Churchman*, Dec. 7, 1889.

SUNDAY IN ST. PETERSBURG.—Twelve hundred St. Petersburg merchants have declared themselves willing to close their places of business on Sunday, with a view of keeping the day as it is understood in the United States and Great Britain. The movement cannot succeed. The Greek Church compels cessation of work in whole or in part on more than seventy man-made holidays. Until this is reformed, the people will have to work on Sunday.—*The Christian Advocate*.

THE following amusing recipe, "How to compose a sermon," is by Dr. Salter, who was Master of the Charterhouse from 1761 to 1778. "Take some scraps out of the best books you have; weigh them, and sift them thoroughly; then divide them into three parts, for dividing them into more is generally thought to crumble them too much. Work these well and handle them neatly, but neither mince nor chop them. Season the whole with a due proportion of salt, put in nothing that is too hard or difficult to digest, but let all be clear and candid; it should have some fire, for that will raise it and prevent it being heavy. You must garnish it with a few flowers, but not so thick as to hide the substance. Take care it is not overdone, for, as it is the last thing served up, if it is not inviting some of the company may not taste of it. In a hard frost or extreme cold weather, it should be done in twenty minutes; in more temperate weather it may take half an hour. If it is done in a quarter of an hour it is fit for a king."

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

ESSAYS IN BIBLICAL GREEK. By EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan, 1889. 8vo, pp. 293. \$2.75.

This "chip" from an English workshop makes us want to see a solid block from the same source. It contains the substance of the writer's Grinfield lectures on the Septuagint, and is one of the freshest, most scholarly, stimulating, and helpful books which has issued from the English press in a long time. It will open the eyes of uncritical readers of the Greek Testament, and it formulates and voices, in part, at least, what has been for some years growing in the minds of scholars, to wit, the vital importance of the Septuagint and of the Old Testament Apocrypha for the correct interpretation of New Testament Greek.

From the splendid exegetical work of such English scholars as Lightfoot and Westcott, the impression has gained ground that the language of the New Testament has been the subject of the most careful and critical study. Hence the statement will come to many as a surprise that "the language of the New Testament has not yet attracted the attention of any considerable scholar;" that "there is no good lexicon, no philological commentary, no adequate grammar." "In our own university," continues the author, "there is no professor of it, but only a small endowment for a terminal lecture and four small prizes." The contrast of this meagre provision with the results of Oriental studies, and the ample facilities for their prosecution, is suggestive and not pleasant, and carries a significant reminder to the theological schools in America where the same tendency is painfully apparent.

Yet no one familiar with the exegetical literature of the New Testament can rise from the perusal of this book without feeling that these statements, strong as they are, are substantially justified by the facts; for it is clearly evident that even in the work of the most eminent modern exegetes, the Septuagint does not occupy the position and influence which are vindicated for it in these essays. It is the classical and not the Hebræo-Greek standard which has been applied to the verbal exegesis of the New Testament. The general identity of biblical and classical Greek has been tacitly assumed; and "in almost every lexicon, grammar, and commentary, the words and idioms of the New Testament are explained, not, indeed, exclusively, but chiefly, by a refer-

ence to the words and idioms of the Attic historians and philosophers. . . . Almost any average scholar who can construe Thucydides is supposed to be thereby qualified to criticise a translation of the gospels."

In any attempt to define the character of New Testament Greek, several elements must be taken into account. That it is a peculiar language is recognized on all hands; but the precise definition of its peculiarities and their causes is a more difficult matter. The changes fall into two general classes due to two different causes. The one class consists of those inevitable modifications incident to the history of every living language, resulting from the external pressure of new social and political conditions, and from the internal drift of the language itself. The other class is the outgrowth of the contact of an Aryan with a Semitic race. Hence the former class finds its parallels in all contemporary Greek; while for the parallels of the other we must look to another literature and to the forms of thought peculiar to another race.

The influence of Alexander's conquests in throwing open the Attic idiom to the inroads of provincialism is a familiar fact; but the changes from this cause were mainly changes in verbal or literary form; while those wrought by the contact of the Greek with the Oriental, struck down into a deeper region. The fusion in Alexandria was not merely a dialectic fusion; it was a fusion, more or less complete, of ideas; an effort to dress Moses in the garb of the Platonists and Stoics; and when the Jew, all over the East, adopted the language of Greece, he forced it to carry ideas which were not its own.

Dr. Hatch graphically pictures the effect of this passage of the Greek language into a new country. It appears prominently in its metaphors. The word-pictures take on a Syrian coloring. Life, which, in the busy streets of Athens is conceived as *ἀναστροφή*, *conversation*, assumes the Syrian conditions of painful travel over hard roads, and becomes a *journey*. "A change in conduct is the turning of the direction of travel (*ἐπιστρέφουσαι*). The hindrances to right conduct are the stones over which a traveler might stumble, or the traps or tanks into which he might fall in the darkness (*σκάνδαλα, προσκόμματα, παγίδες, βόθροι*). The troubles of life are the burdens which the peasants carried on their backs (*φορτία*). Again, the common employments of the Syrian farmers gave rise to the frequent metaphors of sowing and reaping, of sifting the grain and gathering it into the barn (*σπείρειν, θερίζειν, σινιάζειν, συνάγειν*); the

threshing-floor furnished a metaphor for a devastating conquest, and the scattering of chaff by the wind for utter annihilation (*ἀλοῦν, λικμᾶν*)."

A new stamp, moreover, was set upon biblical Greek by the different religious and moral ideas of the race which spoke it. There was a radical difference between the religious conceptions of the men whose theological manual was Homer, and of those who studied Moses. The attitude of the latter toward human nature, life, and God, forced the Greek words to become symbols of ideas which were not Greek. *Μακάριος*, which passed up through the Psalms into the Sermon on the Mount, differed from the *μάκαρ* of Homer and the *μακάριος* of Pindar as character differs from circumstance, or heavenly felicity from earthly happiness; and there is a long stretch from the dominant classical conception of *δίκαιος* as having its basis in social usage, to that which appears in Habbakuk's words, "The just shall live by faith."

What we have to find out, therefore, in studying biblical Greek is "what meaning certain Greek words conveyed to a Semitic mind." To read it simply in the light of Homer, Plato, and Thucydides is to read it without its true key.

In discussing the value of the Septuagint for this study, Dr. Hatch shows that in the fact of the Septuagint being so largely a free or paraphrastic translation from the Hebrew, we have a guard against a too restricted literalism in the rendering of words in biblical Greek, since we are shown, both in another language and in another form, the precise extent of meaning which a word or a sentence was intended to cover. We are shown how many different Greek words express the shades of meaning of a single Hebrew word, and, conversely, how many different Hebrew words explain the meaning of a single Greek word.

After illustrating the free rendering of the Septuagint under the heads of glosses and paraphrases, variations of metaphor, and variations of rendering particular words and phrases, he lays down the following inferences and general rules to be applied to the investigation of the meanings of words in the New Testament. These words fall into two general classes. The first class embraces (a) Certain words common to biblical and contemporary secular Greek, which, since they are designations of concrete ideas, are not appreciably affected by the Semitic element. Thus, *γλωσσόκομον* was originally a box for keeping the mouthpieces of musical instruments. This meaning it loses in

later Greek, being used in the Septuagint of the Ark of the Covenant, the contribution-chest of Joash, and the coffer into which the jewels of gold were put when the ark was sent back. This latter meaning of "a strong box" is recognized in later Attic Greek, and passes into the New Testament in John xii. 6; xiii. 29, where it is used of the common chest of the disciples. (b) Certain words, common to biblical and to contemporary secular Greek, expressing abstract ideas, do not vary in biblical use from their secular use; as is shown by the fact that they are found only in those parts of the New Testament where the style is least affected by Semitic conceptions and forms of speech. Thus *δεισιδαιμον*, which in classical Greek has a good sense, *religious*, passes, in later Greek, into the meaning of *superstitious*, as is shown by its use in Philo, Josephus, and Plutarch; so that it would seem to have had, in the first century and a half of the Christian era, a depreciatory sense, not only in secular but in Christian usage, as appears from Justin Martyr. This fact throws doubt upon the prevailing modern exegesis of Acts xvii. 22, which endeavors to soften Paul's assertion that the Athenians were "rather superstitious," by giving the word its original rather than its contemporary sense. It was probably this consideration which influenced the Revisers of 1881 in retaining *superstitious*, where the American committee insisted on *religious*.

The second class embraces those words which form a great majority in the New Testament, and which, though for the most part common to biblical and to contemporary secular Greek, express in their biblical use the conceptions of a Semitic race, and must consequently be examined by the light of the cognate documents which form the Septuagint.

"These words are so numerous, and a student is so frequently misled by his familiarity with their classical use, that it is a safe rule to let no word, even the simplest, in the New Testament, pass unchallenged. The process of inquiry is (1) to ascertain the classical use of a word, (2) to ascertain whether there are any facts in relation to its biblical use which raise a presumption that its classical use had been altered. Such facts are afforded partly by the context in which the word is found, but mainly by its relation to the Hebrew words which it is used to translate."

The temptation to cite illustrations of the applications of these principles to New Testament words is very strong. We are glad to see such positive testimony to "cove-

nant" as the *invariable* sense of διαθήκη, "especially in a book which is so impregnated with the language of the Septuagint as the Epistle to the Hebrews." A distinction is brought out between two special senses of οἰκονόμος, both of which occur in the New Testament—namely, the *house-steward*, and the *land-steward*. Hence in Luke xvi. point is given to the *land-steward's* remark, "I cannot dig," since a degraded bailiff might be reduced to the status of a farm-laborer. So, in Rom. xvi. 23, the οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως is probably the administrator of the city lands. Πονηρός occurs in Sirach in the sense of *niggardly*, and the corresponding Hebrew word is also sometimes rendered, as in Proverbs, by βάσκανος, with a similar reference to the "evil" or "grudging" eye. This throws light upon the use of the word in Matt. vi. 23, where, from the context, the reference would seem to be, not to goodness or badness in general, but specially to the use of money. This appears to be clearly the sense in Matt. xx. 15. The meaning of "advocate" or "helper" is vindicated for παράκλητος instead of "comforter," which, Dr. Hatch truthfully says, is not required by any passage in St. John.

But we must briefly notice, in conclusion, the relation of the Septuagint to the psychological terms in the New Testament. Others have preceded Dr. Hatch in this field, notably Wendt, in his monograph, "Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im biblischen Sprachgebrauch" (1878), and Professor Dickson in his well-known and most admirable volume, "St. Paul's use of the terms Flesh and Spirit" (1883), which is largely based upon Wendt. To the discussion of the Septuagint usage of these terms, a section is added on their usage by Philo, with the conclusion that Paul's usage differs essentially from Philo's, and that, therefore, the Pauline psychology cannot be interpreted by the Philonian. Dr. Hatch's discussion goes to establish the conclusion which is rapidly gaining ground among students of Paul's writings, that the more subtle metaphysical distinctions between καρδιά, πνεῦμα, ψυχή, are not to be looked for; and that Paul's usage is shaped by that of the Septuagint, where they appear interchanged as translations of the same Hebrew words. "A survey of the predicates which are attached to each of them shows a similar impossibility of limiting them to special groups of mental phenomena, with the exception that καρδιά is most commonly used of will and intention, ψυχή of appetite and desire."

We have not space to notice the chapter

on early quotations from the Septuagint, which is of great value.

Dr. Hatch's book will not only help to assert for New Testament Greek its true place and function, but will also tend to emphasize the elucidation of the New Testament as the true objective-point of Semitic study, and the Septuagint as the true medium of the normal and closer relation between the two.

The style is unpretentious and lucid. An index of Greek words would be helpful. No student of the New Testament can afford to be without the book.

MARVIN R. VINCENT.

THE STORY OF PHœNICIA. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford, etc. (The Story of the Nations Series.) New York: Putnam's Sons. 12mo, pp. xvii., 356. Cloth. Illustrated. Map. \$1.50.

Like the other volumes of this series, this one is printed in good readable type and on excellent paper. The binding is artistic and appropriate. In outward appearance it is of such a character as to make it a pretty book. Only one matter in the mechanical make-up of the volume could be improved—namely, the restoration of some few letters that have fallen out of place and the replacing of some imperfect letters by others whose corners have not suffered violence.

The author has not prefaced his book by any remarks to tell us what the limits of his task are. We are left to infer from the title that it was not his intention to go beyond the point at which Phœnicia ceased to have an independent existence, and consequently we do not find any account of the fortunes of the land since the final conquest by the Romans. But even within these limits, this work, like all other of a similar sort, has the character of a tentative effort. It is not possible to say the last word yet in regard to any of the peoples of Western Asia, where we are expecting new discoveries every day. The merit of a work on any one of them lies in the extent to which the facts of most recent discoveries are made accessible. The completest book is the one that not only gives us all that which, having been heretofore known and stated, has stood the test of criticism, but also at the same time brings down the tale to the very date of publication. The years are strewn with books which have served their purpose and which are now only as mile-stones to mark the progress of knowledge. The same may be said of the present volume, for it

will by no means be considered as the last word on the subject.

The materials for the history of Phœnicia are very much scattered. The remark of Pietschmann (*"Geschichte der Phœnizier,"* p. 3), will long remain true, to the effect: "To-day and for a long time to come it will be impossible to avoid the impression that the representation of Phœnician history is made up of a mosaic of disjointed notes even when one does not merely heap up the details of a dry learning." To go thoroughly into the subject requires an amount of research that is simply amazing to the uninitiated. References must be gathered from the cuneiform records and from the hieroglyphic and "hieratic" writings of Egypt. The Greek and Latin historians must be searched through and their story learned. The scattered notices of the land and people contained in the Old Testament must be sifted and studied. Of modern books on the subject there are not many, but the notes and scraps of information are scattered through periodicals and the proceedings and transactions of the learned societies. The classics on Phœnicia have been Movers and Kendrick, but the book that will replace them will undoubtedly be that of Richard Pietschmann in Oncken's series.

The present book does not pretend to be a complete and exhaustive study of the subject, or if it does it falls short of its aim. It deals in the first place with the land and people, the geography of the former and the characteristics of the latter. Then the colonies and the early history of the efforts of the people in navigation, the connection that they had with the Hebrews, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Persians, the Greeks, and the Romans are treated in order. Here the history comes to a close. The final chapters are taken up with an account of their architecture, manufactures, and works of art, their language, writing, and literature. The story is told in a pleasing way, though there is too much that is technical for a popular book and not enough of detail for a book of reference. But evidently the former is the class in which it is to be placed, and further criticism is, perhaps, uncalled for. For scholarly purposes it lacks the references to the literature which are so marked a feature in the work of Pietschmann.

We note that in speaking of the navigation of the Phœnicians no notice is taken of the late work of Lieblein on their traffic in the Red Sea. The plan of the work excluded mention of the Punic and Carthaginian settlements, except that a long account

of the settlement of Carthage is given in quotation from an unnamed "German critic." It may be apprehended that all will not readily agree with the account of Asherah as the name of the symbol or figure under which Astarte was worshipped (p. 110). The account of the writing of the Phœnicians is also very partial, and the arguments of those who suppose that it was derived from the Egyptian are put aside too readily and with too little reason. It is certainly an extreme statement that there are resemblances between the Phœnician and Egyptian letters only in three or four cases and exact likeness only in one. It must be borne in mind that a long interval existed between the time when the Phœnicians became acquainted with the Egyptians and their culture and the time whence we have any remains of their literature—if it is worthy of the name. And it is further to be remarked that the system of comparison between the letters of the Phœnicians and the complete and perfect hieroglyphics of ancient Egypt is very unfair. The ordinary signs used in business transactions cannot have been these, but rather the more easily-made and the currently-used "hieratic" or even "demotic" writing. It is not possible thus easily to brush aside the work of De Rouge on this interesting topic, to say nothing of the work of Taylor (*"The Alphabet"*).

To the general reader the work will afford a means of gaining a rapid glance at the interesting story of these early and adventurous voyagers, but to the student it will afford comparatively little aid. It will not serve as a guide because the literary signboards have been omitted. Incidentally it appears (p. 294) that the book was written in 1887, and hence some allowance is to be made, but on the whole we lay the book down with some degree of disappointment.

C. R. GILLET.

NAMES AND PLACES IN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT AND APOCRYPHA, WITH THEIR MODERN IDENTIFICATIONS. Compiled by GEORGE ARMSTRONG, and revised by COLONEL SIR CHARLES W. WILSON and MAJOR CONDER. Published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund by Alexander P. Watt, 2 Paternoster Square (London), 1889. 12mo, pp. 190, 24. 3s. 6d.

The compiler of this work tells us in the preface that he has made the list from the various publications of the Palestine Exploration Fund, from Smith's Bible Dictionary, from Clark's Bible Atlas, and from some of the works of Major Conder. The

identifications are those adopted in the maps of the Fund made under the direction of Wilson and Conder. The Old Testament list contains "upward of 1150 names of places in the Holy Land, Mesopotamia, Edom, the Desert of Sinai, and Egypt; being, it is believed, all those that are mentioned in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha." The New Testament list contains 162 names, "of which 144 are known, 10 uncertain, and 8 not identified." Two hundred and ninety of the Old Testament places still await identification.

The compilation proposes to be a gazetteer of the places mentioned in the Bible and the Old Testament Apocrypha. But at the same time it is such only under certain limitations which greatly damage its usefulness as a book of reference. As a geographical index to the publications of the Fund it is valuable, and to a considerable extent also as an independent work, but not so far as might have been wished or as it might easily have been made. Without extending the number of pages or adding to the cost of type-setting there might have been packed a much larger amount of information that would have added very materially to the value of the book and made it more than a mere adjunct of the works that have been published by the Fund. This will appear when we glance at the make-up of the work.

In its arrangement the book is perspicuous. But according to the present plan it is at the expense of much blank space on each page. There are five columns on a page. The first contains the name of the place to be treated printed in heavy-faced type. But the space is so narrow that a very large number of the names have to be run on the second line or in some cases on a third. This makes it more difficult for the eye to take in the name at a glance. This interferes slightly with the rapid use of the book, though it is not a very severe fault. The second column contains the references to the passages in Scripture where the name occurs, and is printed in ordinary type. The third gives the identifications as far as possible, and is printed in italics. The fourth contains references to the Fund's map on some particular sheet of which the place in hand is found. The last column is the most important. At the same time it is in connection with it that we are most likely to find fault. The room that is devoted to the "Remarks and References" is by far too restricted. We expect to find here the full statement with regard to the reasons that have led to the identifications and references to the authorities so that the work

may be kept within our control. But lack of space, despite the exercise of considerable power of condensation, has rendered it impossible to do justice to this part of the work.

It is evident that the various material that enters into the several columns will necessarily be a very variant factor. In one case the references to Scripture take much space and there is no call for extended remark as to identification or proof. At another the citations are few and there is call for a large amount of proof and general statement. The result is evident. The sections are ill balanced and there is much valuable space lost. If the book had been printed like any other book, there could have been effected a saving of nearly if not quite one-half of the size of the book, or an addition of nearly one hundred per cent to its contents and a still larger percentage to its value.

There is no apparent reason why the compiler should have shut his eyes to the results of investigators and explorers other than those connected with the Palestine Fund. We look in vain for any recognition of the work done by Naville and others under the auspices of the Egypt Fund. What is said of Pithom, for instance, is very insufficient. With regard to Succoth the statements are insufficient in one case and false in another. It is said that Succoth was "the first camping-place on leaving Egypt." In a sense this is true, but as Succoth is now known to be identical with Pithom, and to be in Egypt, it is a false statement. But the further assertion that the place is "not identified," shows ignorance. Goshen is said to be "near the Eastern side of the ancient Delta." But this statement is such as to give little or no information as to the locality in question. Why not give the latest opinion, even if it is considered to be subject to later modification, and locate it in the Wadi Tumilat, along the line of the modern railway from Zagazig to Ismaïlia?

It is not evident why the compiler has seen fit to separate the list of Old Testament names from that of the New. Yet such is the arrangement, and one must be careful not to miss any of the information that is contained in the book by failure to look in both.

In its present shape the work is of service mainly in connection with a Bible Dictionary. It will serve to bring down the facts to a later date and to supply some facts that are known as the result of investigations made since the dictionaries issued from the press. But it is to be greatly regretted that the compiler did not adopt a different plan

when he made up his book, and that he did not allow himself to go outside of the works of his Fund for information that would have added very materially to its value and have given us a handbook that should have occupied a place much more prominent than that to which we must assign the present edition.

C. R. GILLET.

THE REDEMPTION OF MAN. DISCUSSIONS BEARING ON THE ATONEMENT. By D. W. SIMON, Ph.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Scribner & Welford, 1889. 8vo, \$4.

Dr. Simon, principal of the Congregational Theological Hall at Edinburgh, has given to the public in this volume, a valuable collection of essays on the redemption of man. These are so suggestive and strong in their presentation of the doctrine of redemption, as set forth in the Scriptures and by the leaders of the Protestant Reformation, that we regret that the author did not work them over with other material into an organic system. Dr. Simon has unusual critical sagacity. He is familiar with the history of doctrine, especially since the Reformation, and he uses his knowledge with great skill. He shows that the leaders of modern orthodoxy have departed from the Scriptures and the faith of the Reformation in several important particulars in the doctrine of redemption. The introduction is a long essay of 68 pages, in which there is a critical classification of the various theories of the atonement. His first group is the *objective* theories, embracing the *crypto dualistic* and the *Godward* theories. Under the *crypto dualistic* he includes not only the mediæval theory, that Christ's death was a ransom to the devil; but also the modern theory, that it was a satisfaction to an external law. Under this head he discusses the so-called "orthodox" theory of satisfaction to divine justice, as taught by Turretine, Crawford, and the Hodges. He shows that their theory of *judicial* satisfaction really makes the divine justice something apart from God to which God Himself is obliged to conform. He also shows that God's justice exacts something more of men than penalty for sin—"Justice can be done to God only by the redemption of man." "Every sinner condemned to eternal death is an eternal loss to God." "Theologians have concealed from themselves, unintentionally the true nature of the position they were taking up, by substituting abstractions like 'divine justice,' 'the law,' and so forth, for God, whenever they got directly face to face with it; and unwittingly

they often lapsed either into dualism or subjectivism." In this connection Dr. Simon shows that the Hodges have forsaken the older view, that the sufferings of Christ were a full and perfect equivalent for the penalty of sinners (not in duration but in intensity), and have taken an intermediate view that they were such only as the divine justice demanded of the Substitute. This "'Old-school' Presbyterian view is neither one thing nor the other—a half-way house occupied by travellers whose faces are set 'New-school' way."

The "*Godward*" theories are introduced by some profound remarks, among which we shall quote the following:

"The theological custom of speaking of the *justice* of God having its claims might suggest the idea that this was one of the ends of Christ's work which a *Godward* theory might have to consider. But the justice of God is merely an abstract way of speaking of God as just, of the just God. God is just; therefore He gives to every one his due. God is holy; therefore He seeks to preserve and secure what is due to Himself. In speaking of rendering justice to God, we use words of wide scope. What is due to God? Not as I have already remarked the punishment of sinners; that is the due of sinners, which God, through the cosmic order, which is the expression of His mind and will, renders to them; but the *sinners themselves are His due*, with all their powers of body and mind. . . . The limitation of the scope of justice to penalty and the like has been a mistake fraught in the history of the Christian Church down to the present moment, with the saddest consequences alike to theology and practice, to intellect and heart" (pp. 29-30).

Dr. Simon brings into prominence the fact that the Reformers made much of the anger of God and represented the passion of Christ as a propitiation to God, who was displeased, angry, indignant at sin. "By degrees, however, the anger of God ceased to be mentioned, save as a kind of synonym of God's fixed purpose to punish sin; or of the threatenings of the law; or of the necessity that sin be punished, and so forth; and this has continued to be the custom down to the present day." Later on Dr. Simon gives a chapter to the consideration of the anger of God, which is full of instruction, closing with the sentence: "He has doubtless cause to be angry with all men; but He is as far as possible from being equally angry with all; and, accordingly, while from some He does but for a moment hide His face, and others are chastened, others, again, have to

feel the weight of His hand, there may be those whom He is compelled by self-consistency and holiness to cast into the outer darkness" (p. 262).

Under the head of the *Godward* theories there are careful criticisms of Maurice, Gess, Dorner, Campbell, Newman Smythe, and Edward White.

The second group of theories are the so-called "moral" theories, embracing especially the *governmental* theory and *dynamic* theories. Under the *governmental* theory Dr. Simon discusses the views of Wace, Albert Barnes, Gilbert, and many others; under the *dynamic* theories he reviews Maggee, F. W. Robertson, and Schleiermacher. In his first chapter Dr. Simon treats of "The Atonement and the Kingdom of God." He maintains that the "end of the mission of Christ was to establish the kingdom of God, not in the *de jure* sense, for in that sense it already existed, but in the *de facto* sense; in other words, to realize the kingdom of heaven." The second chapter discusses the "Constitution of Humanity," showing that we must consider man as an individual and also mankind as an organism; and the problem of the passion of Christ needs to be approached from both sides if it is to be adequately treated. The third chapter, on "The Relations of Man to God," contains many profound thoughts. "Man can never become an object of indifference to God." "No creature constitutes a cosmos of its own within which it shall be independent of God." "Were man's nature true, it would go out in reverence as surely as the magnetic needle turns to the north." "Trust toward God is rooted in our creaturehood." "Love, however, is the crown or ripe blossom of personal relations." "Neither God nor man can be satisfied till reverence and trust are taken up and transformed into love." The corporate relations of man to God are also carefully considered, both ethically and historically, and especially at the point of representation. The normal relation is thus stated: "The function of the representative would have been, as has been said, to combine, as in a focus, what is otherwise broken up and scattered; to provide it fit and adequate expression; to make known also to the individual members the life of the whole; and thus to render it possible for them at once to ratify and share it" (p. 139). He then shows that the history of Israel was typical in this regard. Chapter IV. is a careful study of the "Hebrew Sin-offerings with Ethnic Parallels," Chapter V. treats of "The Anger of God," Chapter VI. on "The Forgiveness of Sin,"

is a very important chapter. It shows how modern orthodoxism has departed from the faith of the Reformation and the Scriptures in this particular. "The Bible never associates forgiveness and punishment," and yet modern divines limit forgiveness of sin to the removal of the penalty. Dr. Simon carefully considers all the passages of Scripture treating of forgiveness of sin, and quotes largely from the Reformers, and then shows how the scholastic Protestants changed the faith, identified forgiveness with freedom from penalty, and imputed righteousness with worthiness of reward or life. This fault is common to New-school and Old-school theologians in modern times. But the climax is reached in Dr. Charles Hodge, who says: "A pardoned criminal is not only just as much a criminal as he was before, but his sense of guilt and remorse of conscience are in no degree lessened. Pardon can remove only the outward and arbitrary penalty. The sting of sin remains."

Dr. Simon justly exclaims, in view of such language, and other similar citations: "And this is the theology that claims to be *par excellence* biblical and 'orthodox,' according to the recognized standards and divines of Protestantism!"

Dr. Simon justly says: "God does not forgive us as Sovereign, or as Ruler, or as Judge, but as God, who, as God, is Creator, Father, Ruler, Judge; and as such, in all these aspects, expects and claims the holding of all the specifically personal, natural relations, especially those which are described by such terms as reverence, trust, love. Forgiveness relates to the past, acceptance to the present and the future. God treats the past relation, with its failings and sins, as though it had not been; and treats the sinner again as His friend and son. The relation is what it should be after having been what it should not be" (p. 86).

The book closes with chapters on the *Passio Christi*, the Passion of Christ, the Passion of Man, the Atonement and Prayer, and the Influence of the Death of Christ—all valuable and suggestive. The author's views of redemption come out most strongly in the second of these chapters, where he tries to show that the Passion of Christ is the Passion of Man. "The Logos, who, as I said, is the whole—the human in man—stands for man—really and not assumedly or forensically, or by any fictitious, arbitrary process whatever, as the whole; and what He therefore does or suffers for the whole is, and is regarded as the doing or suffering of the whole" (p. 338). "What He has

done becomes ours ; it could not be ours if it were not first of all His ; but it would be of no use to us unless it became ours ; nay, indeed, in view of the relation between Him and us, it could not be His without being potentially ours. According to Scripture, which in this is as true to human nature as it is to the moral cosmos, Christ becomes ours, and we become His by faith" (p. 341). "He becomes our Substitute, He endured our penalty, and His endurance is constituted our endurance" (p. 361).

This profound work is worthy of a more thorough exposition than we have been able to give to it. It shows that true progress in theology is to take place by a revival of the faith of the Reformation, a throwing aside the modern errors of orthodoxism, and a bringing forth of the treasures of the divine Word.

C. A. BRIGGS.

A CHAPTER IN ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY: BEING THE MINUTES OF THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE FOR THE YEARS 1698-1704 TOGETHER WITH ABSTRACTS OF CORRESPONDENTS' LETTERS DURING PART OF THE SAME PERIOD. Edited by the REV. EDMUND MCCLURE, M.A., Editorial Secretary. London, 1888. 12mo, pp. vii., 375.

It is to be regretted that this "Chapter of English Church History" remains practically unwritten. No one will doubt that there are materials contained in this book which, when supplemented by facts drawn from other sources, would enable to the writing of such a chapter, and there can be no question as to the interest that it would have. But in the present volume it has not been put before the public. This publication, like all others of the same character, labors under the great disadvantage of being in the main confined to the data that the original scribe saw fit to incorporate in his records. For the most part there are only meagre notes without detail, and that there was some dissatisfaction with these minutes in particular is evident from the mention in several places of the fact that there was a committee on "defective minutes" and various attempts to perfect them.

In the preface the editor has attempted a slight review of the work of the Society during these few years, but what he there says is only in the most general terms, and leaves us with only the barest intimation of the scope of the work actually done. If he had only seen fit to have prepared a tolerably full account by way of preface, he would have placed us under obligations and

have made the book far more valuable than it can be at present.

Lacking such an account by way of preface, it was natural to seek a guide through the mass of minutes in the index. It is to be recognized that the making of an index to a work like the present is no easy task. It abounds with names, and only the utmost care and the most unceasing vigilance will enable one to perform the task with success. It is little to be wondered that we find omissions of names and of references to them in the index, and a slight examination has proved that names of some importance have been overlooked. But the main fault with the index lies in the fact that there has been no attempt at all to group the entries in any sort of order of topics. In using it as it now stands one cannot be at all sure that one has not omitted mention of something that is of vital importance to the completeness of the view of any given subject. To us the part which is of greatest importance is the account of the various steps taken to extend Christian knowledge in the colonies and plantations. But to America there are only two references, to Jamaica not any, to the Barbadoes one, and the others to affairs here are scattered about under the names of the various States and cities in alphabetical order, to the great disadvantage of one who would gain a view of the whole field. But that is not the worst of it. Many of the most important references to affairs in this country are hid under the names of men of whom we have never heard, and of whom we here learn for the first time. But till we have got the desired information about any particular field and have no further use for the index, we are not in a position to be able to use it to advantage. As a case in point may be mentioned the "Proposals" of Rev. Patrick Gordon for the propagation of the Gospel among the Indians of North America. The index has no reference to the Indians, but only to Mr. Gordon. We should like to know what those proposals were, but the scribe has not left a record that is calculated to satisfy that desire. His opinion and that of the committee that declared them to be "impracticable," do not seem to have been shared by the proposer, for in several letters that are preserved in abstracted form, he shows a very keen and at times almost laughable desire to learn their fate.

It is a matter of surprise that at that time, 1699-1704, the men who organized this Society should have taken so much into their field of operations. It took up the work of the societies that had preceded it, having

the reformation of the manners of the time at heart. Charity schools were established wherever it was possible, and the movement met with great success. They early entered into correspondence with evangelical Christians on the Continent. To reach the Dutch they caused books to be translated into that language. Among the sailors in the navy they caused tracts to be distributed, and if we may judge of the practices of the sailors by the literature that was to meet their wants, we should say that drunkenness and profanity abounded. Proposals were early made for the prosecution of work among the Greeks. Jamaica, the "Plantations," Virginia, New York, Pennsylvania, and New England, all came in for a share. Practically their operations were world-wide.

Covering thus a field that was too broad for a single society, we have little wonder that the appearance of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was hailed with delight, and that they went so far as to advance the money that was needed to secure the royal charter.

A few quotations will serve to show the scope of the work so far as it relates to America. In Dr. Bray's "Memorial" (p. 21) it is said: "To induce a learned, studious, and sober clergy to go into the service of the Church in those parts [the Plantations], it seems necessary that parochial libraries should be fixed in every cure of souls, consisting of some of the best books in divinity, both commentaries on the Holy Scriptures and treatises on the doctrines and duties of Christianity." Soon after we read: "As to the parochial libraries for the clergy in the Plantations, there are thirty advanced to a pretty good perfection, and a foundation laid of seventy more, in all to a value of near two thousand pounds." Books to the value of five hundred pounds were also sent for gratuitous distribution among the people of the colonies.

Subscriptions were received for the purposes of the Society in the colonies from all classes, from the king down. One contribution was of a peculiar sort. On page 31 we read:

"Dr. Bray reports that Mr. Ibbott, a minister, has given one share in Sir Humfrey Macworth's mines toward the promoting of libraries in North America."

The aid of prominent men in the Plantations, in New England, and New York was asked and secured by the Society as correspondents. The Governors of Virginia and Massachusetts, and ministers and laymen in other parts of the land were made correspondents and they seem to have done good

service. Correspondence was carried on to a considerable extent, and there is frequent reference to the letters from America that were read at the stated meetings, but they have not been preserved in all cases. Where they have they contain some hints as to the state of religion here at the time. A statement in one of these letters from Mr. Elias Neau, of New York, contained in the Abstracts of Correspondence, is as follows: "That the Society has been imposed upon by the accounts of the conversion of the Quakers, there being but a few truly converted, and those which are live in great remissness. That they are so far from being able to set up schools, that they can't maintain their ministers, and that there are several places in the country where there are none. That they are overwhelmed with taxes and that their governors drain them."

It would be interesting to know what the books were which were sent for distribution in the colonies, but the minutes are almost silent on this topic. Only a few references are made to them and then they seem to have been of the usual stock, which seem to have had a peculiar attraction to these men, if we may judge from the freedom with which they distributed them among sailors, prisoners, and others, even going so far as to lead them to cause them to be translated into Dutch for distribution in Holland and in New York. Some of the titles that have been preserved to us, are as follows: A persuasive toward the observation of the Lord's day; A kind caution to profane swearers; Caution against the sin of drunkenness; Kind caution against the sin of Uncleaness. Besides these they sent at various times large and small Bibles, prayer-books, and catechisms. An appropriation of £6 was made for books for a Mr. Evans, in Philadelphia, and when the list was completed the Society did not hesitate to audit a bill for £12 11s. The reported immigration of French refugees to Virginia at once aroused their interest and aid was promptly ordered.

But books and letters were not the only things sent over. At one place we find the record: "Dr. Bray reported that nine missionaries to the Plantations are in a very fair way to be completed, £400 per annum being already subscribed, besides £50 extraordinary."

No love was lost on the Quakers, though the efforts of Robert Keith for their conversion were ably and zealously seconded. Thus we read of the Deism of William Penn, and that Pennsylvania is about half full of Quakers whom they longed to convert. They used a different word, however, when

they said: "As to the reduction of Quakers, there is a subscription carrying on and considerably advanced to that purpose by some excellent persons."

But time would fail to give an adequate idea of the varied contents of this book. It is a mine from which gems may be derived, but the vast amount of dross and rubbish of routine minutes obscures their brightness. Unfortunately the index is not the guide through its mazes that it should be, and so one is left to grope along as best one may, or is tempted to throw the whole down in disgust. It is a thankless task to make such a book, and it is only fair to say that the editor seems to have done his work well, and he has certainly added to the value by the addition of foot-notes.

C. R. GILLETT.

LABOR AND LIFE OF THE PEOPLE. VOL. I., EAST LONDON. Edited by CHARLES BOOTH. 1889. London: Williams & Norgate. 8vo, pp. 600. Colored map. 10s. 6d.

Every worker among the poor in London and elsewhere must rejoice in the appearance of such a work as this, which is the first scientific attempt to present facts as they are, and not as colored by vivid imaginations. Mr. Booth in this volume presents the results of three years of careful work among the poor of the "East End" in London, which throw a flood of light on the difficult problems that there meet the philanthropist. The various chapters have been contributed by specialists in their respective fields, and are as near to the truth as anything that has yet seen the light of day. When it is remembered that the population covered numbers over 900,000 souls, the magnitude of the labor involved in the attempt to gather reliable statistics may be imagined.

Mr. Booth has divided the population into six classes, according to their general condition, viewed from a financial standpoint. These are:

1. Professional classes and large shopkeepers.
2. Regular employment, good regular earnings.
3. Mixed with poverty.
4. Poor—those who have a bare income.
5. Very poor—those who are in chronic want.
6. Very poor, vicious, and semi-criminal.

A colored chart which accompanies the volume gives these divisions clearly to the eye, and is an invaluable addition to the book. Workers in that part of the city need only to consult their chart to see by the coloring what the economic condition of a given street is.

Those interested in such details will be glad to know that, although there is a vast amount of poverty in the aggregate in that part of London, yet the figures will not bear out some of the wholesale statements that have found utterance in the press from time to time. We give the figures and percentages below:

1. Well-to-do, 79,000, 8.8 per cent of the whole.
2. Regular employment, 498,000, 56 per cent of the whole.
3. Mixed with poverty, 129,000, 14.5 per cent of the whole.
4. Poor—those who have a bare income, 74,000, 8.3 per cent of the whole.
5. Very poor—those in chronic want, 100,000, 11.2 per cent of the whole.
6. Very poor, vicious, and semi-criminal, 11,000, 1.2 per cent of the whole.

These figures are far from discouraging, when we remember the total which they represent—namely, a population of 900,000 souls.

As a specimen of the detailed way in which the work has been done, I give the following representative case of the very poor but honest class:

"No. 2 furnishes another example of what I mean by very poor. Mr. R—, the father, is old and blind, and has a weekly pension of 5s. 6d. His wife only earns money hopping and fruiting. She keeps the house clean, and both she and her husband are reputed to be quite sober. There are five daughters, but one is married and gone away. The eldest at home, who ruined her health at the lead works, does sack-making or bottle-washing. The second girl works in a seed factory, and gives her mother 6s. a week. The third, similarly employed, gives 5s. to 6s., making the family house money about 17s. 6d. a week. This family live to the greatest possible extent from hand to mouth. Not only do they buy almost everything on credit from one shop, but if the weeks tested are a fair sample of the year, they every week put in and take out of pawn the same set of garments on which the broker every time advances 16s. This makes 17s. 4d. a year for the accommodation. On the other hand, even on credit they buy nothing until they actually need it. They go to their shop as an ordinary housewife to her canisters. Twice a day they buy tea, or three times if they make it so often. In thirty-five days they made *thirty-two purchases of tea*, and of sugar *seventy-seven purchases* in the same time."

This will give some idea of the care with which the minor details of this much-to-be-prized volume have been prepared.

A. F. SCHAUFFLER.

NOTES, MAGAZINES, AND BIBLIOGRAPHY.

THE EDITOR OF THE CONCISE DICTIONARY OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE returns his sincere thanks to his correspondents, Rev. President E. Dodge, D.D., LL.D., and Rev. P. Anstadt, D.D., for their kind correction of two errors in the DICTIONARY, which he made by following German authorities. President Dodge corrects p. 45, col. 2, l. 24 from below, so as to read: Trine immersion and pouring, the use of; and Rev. Dr. Anstadt corrects p. 61, col. 1, art. *Astrology*, l. 14, so as to omit the name of Luther, who was, as he was kind enough to show, in this respect, as in so many others, beyond his age. See Dr. Anstadt's article in the *Lutheran Observer* of December 20, 1889.

THE kindness of Dr. Schaff enables us to announce a forthcoming work of his upon *Creed Revision in the Presbyterian Church*, which will contain the new creed of the Presbyterian Church of England.

HARPER'S NEW MONTHLY MAGAZINE for January is the 476th number. We trust the cover, so unlike that of other magazines, will be the same on the 4760th number! Mr. Howard Pyle's "Jamaica, New and Old," fully illustrated, is followed by a Russian general's article on "The Russian Army," also illustrated, in which a tribute is paid to the sublime obedience of the Russian soldier. Mrs. L. C. Lillie handles "Two Phases of American Art"—Thomas Cole and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. The illustrations are interesting. Miss Anna C. Brackett has an excellent article on "A Woman on Horseback." Very striking are her remarks upon the essentially stupid way in which the mental education of horses is neglected. To those who like that sort of thing, "A Night at Ouseley Manor" will bring ghosts. "The Philosophy of Chinese," by Mr. John Heard, Jr., would discourage any young man contemplating going as a missionary to China. "The Smyrna Fig Harvest" and "St. Andrews"—the latter by Mr. Andrew Lang—both illustrated, close the number, except the editorial departments. But besides the articles named are stories and poems.

THE MAGAZINE OF AMERICAN HISTORY for January has these contributed articles: "William Cullen Bryant in History," by Mrs. Martha J. Lamb; "Rare Piece of Early New York," by Dr. Thomas Addis Enamet; "Uncle Tom's Cabin and Mrs. Stowe," by Florine Thayer McCray; "St. Anthony's Face," by Hon. J. O. Dykman; "Federal and Anti-Federal," by Hon. Gerry W. Hazleton; "Impress of Nationalities upon the City of New York," by Hon. James V. Gerard; "Ralph Izard, the South Carolina Statesman," by G. E. Manigault, M.D.; "American Republics—their Differences," by George M. Pavey.

SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE for January is the opening number of the seventh volume. Its first article is on "Water-storage in the West," by Walter Gillette Bates, finely illustrated. Mr. W. C. Brownell, who has won an enviable reputation by his incisive studies of French character, begins his notes and impressions of "The Paris Exposition." "The French," he quotes with approval an American commissioner as saying, "are naturally exhibition 'sharps.'" The recent exhibition was a fresh proof of their ability in that line. Mr. Brownell found the Eiffel Tower "not only not vulgar, but agreeable." This was true of the exhibition as a whole. No part was more conspicuous than that contributed by the Orient, using the term in its broadest sense. Mr. Brownell describes several of the Oriental dances. He also discourses on the pictures. "Tripoli of Barbary" is the theme of A. F. Jacassay, to which the illustrations are mostly character sketches. Mr. Henry T. Finck has a congenial theme in "The Beauty of Spanish Women." The illustrations are mostly copies. All bear out Mr. Finck's assertion of the lustre of the Spanish woman's complexion. "Electricity in the Household" is an instructive article by O. E. Kenelly. One picture, representing a sewing-machine run by electricity, is doubtless a prophecy of what will be a common sight, ere long. There is a plan of wiring a

house for its various electrical appliances, including a fan which will cool its fortunate owner during hot weather. Scribner has yielded to criticism, perhaps, and furnishes an editorial department entitled "The Point of View." Besides these articles are some poems and stories.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for January, 1890, has one article, entitled "A Precursor of Milton," which is of theological interest. It is upon Avitus, Archbishop of Vienne, France, in the fifth century. Very little is known of him, but he has great interest from the fact, already noticed in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, that his poem in five books, drawn from Genesis and Exodus, presents so many points of similarity to Milton's "Paradise Lost" as to awaken the suspicion that Milton borrowed more than he would acknowledge from him. The other articles have the literary flavor which characterizes this magazine.

LIPPINCOTT'S for January has a good deal of Hawthorne. Julian Hawthorne has the complete story of the month, "Millicent and Rosalind," and also edits his father's "Elxir of Life," a posthumous story, or rather the first instalment of it, for it is to be continued in three successive numbers of *Lippincott's*. Mr. William Westall's "Newspaper Fiction" is an article on the experiment made in England to imitate the Continental *feuilleton*. Mr. Stoddard contributes an article on "Nathaniel Parker Willis." The other articles are of divergent interest.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD for January, 1890, is the opening number of the third volume of this periodical. We are glad to see it in a new cover. The articles in the January number are good. Dr. Pierson answers affirmatively his own question, "Is there to be a New Departure in Missions?" "Education as an Evangelistic Agency" is discussed by Rev. James Johnston, the Secretary of the late London Conference on Foreign Missions, not to be confounded with another person of the same name. Mr. Johnston, the author of the article under notice, is a well-informed, careful, and painstaking man, who has seen service in the China mission field. He is particularly qualified to speak upon his chosen theme, because he has made the educational wants of India a special study. He says that what he calls "an educational mission" "is not the normal form of missionary agency, and is only justifiable in exceptional conditions of society, of which India is the most typical example." Yet he vindicates the place of such a mission, and removes some misconceptions relating to it. The article is well worth reading. Dr. Pierson continues his series on "The Miracles of Missions," and treats of the Bishop of the Niger, Samuel Adjal Crowther, whose striking face meets us on first opening the number. Professor Henry Woodward Hulbert, of Marietta College, has a brief but instructive article on "The Historical Geography of the Christian Church," a subject to which he has paid special attention. Dr. Ellinwood writes on "Asceticism in Missions," Mr. Starbuck's department is that of condensed translations from foreign missionary magazines, and is always full of good matter. The rest of the number is filled as usual.

THE COSMOPOLITAN for January has an attractive table of contents. Its opening article is on "Bougereau, Artist and Man," by Carroll Beckwith. The next article is on Columbia College, by Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen. The illustrations are numerous. Mr. Mayo W. Hazeltine discourses on "Thrones that will Totter next," and without laying claim to prophetic insight, he is safe in saying that these are those of Spain, Portugal, Rumania, Servia, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, and Sweden. But, in fact, all the European thrones are tottering. "Sugar-cane and Sugar Making" (illustrated), by William H. Ballow; "The Development of the Coat and Waistcoat" (illustrated), by William Hamilton Bell; "A Cruise around Antigua" (illustrated), by Poultnie Bigelow; "Famous Beauties" (illustrated), by Elizabeth Bissland; "Blenheim the Famous" (illustrated), by Charles S. Pelham-Clinton; and "The Romantic Story of a Great Corporation," aside from the fiction and the poetry and the editorial departments, make up this good number.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGY, RELIGION, AND ETHICS.

In order to meet an undoubted demand for information with regard to current publications in the field of theological science, this first instalment is sent forth, with the hope that it may prove itself of service.

ADAMS, Myron. The Continuous Creation. An application of the evolutionary philosophy to the Christian religion. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Pp. vi., 259, crown 8vo, \$1.50.

ALLEN, A. V. G. Jonathan Edwards. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 16mo, cloth, \$1.25.

ALLEN, T. W. Notes on Abbreviations in Greek Manuscripts. With eleven pages of fac-similes by photo-lithography. New York: Macmillan, 1889. Pp. 40, 8vo, cloth, \$1.25.

ANTONINI PLACENTINI ITINERARIUM. Im unentstellten Text mit deutscher Uebersetzung. Herausgegeben von J. Gildemeister. Berlin: Reuther, 1889. Pp. xxiv., 68, 8vo, 3 mks.

ARYAN SUN MYTHS. The origin of religions. With an Introduction by Charles Morris. Troy, N. Y.: Nims & Knight, 1889. Pp. 192, 12mo, \$1.25.

BARING-GOULD. Our Inheritance. A popular account of the Holy Eucharist during the first three centuries. New York: James Pott & Co. 8vo, cloth, \$3.80.

BARTHE, J. Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen. I. Hälfte. Die schlichten Nomina. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 10 mks.

BLAKE, Wilson W. The Cross, Ancient and Modern. New York: Randolph & Co. 4to, cloth, \$1.50.

BRADLEE, Caleb D., D.D. Sermons for all Sects. Boston: W. B. Clarke & Co., 1888. Pp. 253, 12mo.

BRECHT, Theodor. Kirche und Sklaverei. Ein Beitrag zur Lösung des Problems der Freiheit. Barmen: Klein, 1890. Pp. iv., 227, 12mo, paper, \$1.10.

BRIGGS, Charles A. Biblical History. A lecture delivered at the opening of the term of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, September 19, 1889. Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. ii., 45, post 8vo, 80 cts.

BRUCE, Alexander B. (Professor, Glasgow). The Kingdom of God; or, Christ's Teachings according to the Synoptical Gospels. New York: Scribner & Welford. Pp. 344, 12mo, cloth, \$3.00.

BURTON, Nathaniel J., D.D. Yale Lectures on Preaching, and other Writings. Edited by Richard E. Burton. New York: Charles L. Webster & Co. 8vo, cloth, \$3.75; to ministers, \$3.00.

BURY, J. B. A History of the Later Roman Empire, from Arcadius to Irene (395-800 A.D.). New York: Macmillan, 1889. 2 vols., 8vo, cloth, \$8.00.

CAIRD, Edward (Professor, Glasgow). The Critical Philosophy of Immanuel Kant. New York: Macmillan. 2 vols., 8vo, \$7.50.

CASPARI, Walter (Professor Theology, Erlangen). Die evangelische Konfirmation vornämlich in der lutherischen Kirche. Erlangen und Leipzig: Böhmke, 1890. Pp. 172, 8vo, paper, \$1.10.

CHANDLER, Mrs. G. W. Methodist-Episcopalianism. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1889. Pp. iii., 134, cloth, 65 cts.

CHANEY, George Leonard. Belief. [Discourses.] Boston: Roberts Bros. Pp. 159, 16mo, cloth, \$1.00.

CLARK, Rufus W., Rev. The Church in the House: Daily Family Prayers for Morning and Evening. New York: Whitaker, 1890. Pp. 118, 12mo, cloth, 60 cts.

CONDER, C. B., Major. Palestine. With maps and illustrations. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. 12mo, \$1.25.

CONE, Orello, D.D. (Editor). Essays, Doctrinal and Practical, by Fifteen Clergymen. With an Introduction by H. W. Thomas, D.D. Boston: Universalist Publishing House, 1889. Pp. vi., 323, 12mo, \$1.00.

CROOKER, Joseph Henry. Problems in American Society. Some social studies. Boston: George H. Ellis, 1889. Pp. 293, 12mo, \$1.25.

DALE, R. W., LL.D. (of Birmingham). The New Evangelicalism and the Old. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1889. 1s.

DALMAN, G. H. Studien zur biblischen Theologie. Der Gottesname Adonai und seine Geschichte. Berlin: Reuther. Pp. 91, 8vo, 2.80 mk.

DEEMS, Charles F., D.D. The Gospel of Common Sense. A series of discourses on the Epistle of St. James. New York: Wilbur E. Ketcham, 13 Cooper Union. Pp. 320, \$1.50.

DRUMMOND, Henry. The Greatest Thing in the World. Address on 1 Cor. xiii. New York: James Pott & Co. White morocco, 35 cts.

DUFFIELD, Samuel W., the late Rev. Latin Hymn Writers and their Hymns. Edited and completed by Rev. R. E. Thompson, D.D., of the University of Pennsylvania. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 8vo, cloth, \$3.00.

DUNN, L. R., Rev. The Gospel in the Book of Numbers. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1889. Pp. 268, cloth, \$1.

EDDY, Robert, D.D. (Editor). The Universalist Register; giving Statistics of the Universalist Church and other Denominational Information . . . for 1890. Boston: Universalist Publishing House. Pp. 112, 12mo, paper, 25 cts.

ELY, Richard T. Social Aspects of Christianity, and other Essays. New York: T. Y. Crowell & Co. 12mo, 90 cts.

ERDMAN, John Edward. The History of Philosophy. Translated by several English and American scholars, and edited by Professor W. S. Hough. New York: Macmillan. 3 vols., 8vo, \$10.50.

EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE. Third series, 1st vol. Watson, R. A., Rev. Judges and Ruth. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 7s. 6d.

FELDNER, Gundisalv. Die Lehre des heiligen Thomas von Aquin über die Willensfreiheit der vernünftigen Wesen. Eine philosophische Studie. Graz: Meyerhoff, 1890. Pp. xlii., 274, 8vo, paper, \$1.50.

FORBES, S. Russell. The Footsteps of St. Paul in Rome. An historical memoir, from the Apostle's landing at Puteoli to his death, A.D. 62-64. 2d edition, revised and enlarged. New York: James Pott & Co. 12mo, illustrated, cloth, 80 cts.

GILBERT, A. N. Standard Eclectic Commentary on the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1890. With geographical notes by J. W. McGarvey. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co. Pp. viii., 202, map and illustrations, 8vo, cloth, \$1.00.

GILBERT, George H. The Poetry of Job. Chicago: A. C. McClurg. Pp. iv., 234, 12mo, \$1.00.

GLOËL, Johannes (Professor Theology, Erlangen). Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes auf ihre Berechtigung geprüft. Erlangen und Leipzig: Böhmke, 1890. Pp. 96, 8vo, paper, 70 cts.

GRANT, P. W. The Revelation of St. John: An Exposition. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1889. Pp. 636, 8vo, 6s.

GRIFFIS, William Elliot, D.D. The Lily among Thorns: A Study of the Biblical Drama, entitled "The Song of Songs." Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Pp. ii., 274, 16mo, white cloth, gilt top, \$1.50; plain, \$1.25.

GULDENPENNING, A. Die Kirchengeschichte des Theodoret von Kyrrhos. Eine Untersuchung ihrer Quellen. Halle: Niemeyer, 1889. Pp. 101, 8vo, 2 mks.

GWATKINS, H. M., M.A. The Arian Controversy. New York: Randolph, 1889. Cloth, 80 cts.

HAGENBACH, K. H. Encyclopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften. 12th edition. Herausgegeben von Reischle. Leipzig: Hirzel. 8vo, 7 mks.

HAMER, D. Jones. Salt and Light, and other Sermons. With portrait. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.

HAMILTON, Thomas, D.D. Our Rest Day: Its Origin, History, and Claims. New York: Wilbur E. Ketcham, 13 Cooper Union. Cloth, 75 cts.

HAND-COMMENTAR ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT. Bearbeitet von Holtzman, Lipsius, Schmiedel, und von Soden. I. Die Synoptiker—Die Apostelgeschichte. Von Professor H. J. Holtzman, Strassburg. Freiburg i. B.: Mohr. 27 Bogen, 8vo, 6 mks.

HARE, George Emlen, D.D., LL.D. Visions and Narratives of the Old Testament. New York: Dutton & Co., 1889. Pp. 196, 12mo, \$—.

HARPER, Henry A. The Bible and Modern Discoveries. With map and illustrations. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1889. 8vo, \$4.50.

HARRIS, John Tindall. The Writings of the Apostle John. With notes, critical and expository. [Vol. I, The Gospel and Epistles, 10s. 6d.] Vol. II, The Revelation. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Royal 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

HATCH, Edwin, D.D. (Reader in Ecclesiastical History, Oxford). Essays in Biblical Greek. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889. 8vo, \$2.75.

HAYDN, Joseph. Dictionary of Dates relating to all Ages and Nations, for Universal Reference. 19th edition, to end of 1889, by B. Vincent; with an American supplement, containing 200 additional pages, by George P. Putnam. New York: Putnam, 1889. Pp. 1094, 8vo, cloth, \$5.00.

HERZOG, J. J. Abriss der gesammten Kirchengeschichte, 2d edition. Besorgt von Kofmane. Vol. I, Part I. Erlangen. Large 8vo, 7 mk.

HÜCKSTÄDT, Ernst, Dr. Der Lehrbegriff des Hirtens. Ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Anklam: Vereinshaus, 1889. Pp. 66, 8vo, paper, 45 cts.

HURLBUT, Jesse L., D.D. The Lesson Commentary on the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1890. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Pp. xiv., 339, map and illustrations, 8vo, cloth, \$1.25.

JOHANSSON, Claes Elis. (Docent, Upsala). Die Heilige Schrift und die negative Kritik. Ein Beitrag zur Apologetik. Deutsch von Joh. Clausen. Mit einem Anhang über rechte und falsche Verteidigung der Bibel von Franz Delitzsch. Autorisierte Ausgabe. Leipzig: Dörrfling & Franke, 1889. Pp. iv., 240, 8vo, paper, \$1.50.

KABISCH, R. Das IV. Buch Esra, auf seine Quellen untersucht. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1889. Pp. viii., 176, 8vo, 4 mk.

KEMPIS, Thomas à. The Imitation of Christ (Mansie Ecclesiastica). New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 16mo, cloth, \$1.00.

KILLEN, W. D. The Ancient Church: Its History, Doctrine, Worship and Constitution traced for the First Three Hundred Years. New edition, carefully revised, with Preface by J. Hall. London: Nisbet, 1889. Pp. 646, 8vo, 12s.

KOLDE, Theodor (Professor, Erlangen). Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte. 1. Wie wurde Cocheus zum Gegner Luthers? 2. Das zweite Breve Adrians an Friedrich den Weisen vom Jahre, 1522. 3. Zum Prozess des Johann Denk und "der drei göttlosen Maler von Nürnberg." 4. Nürnberg und Luther vor dem Reichstage zu Augsburg, 1530. (Abdruck aus den Kirchengeschichtlichen Studien.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1890. Pp. 195-263, 8vo, paper, 45 cts.

KROKER, P. Die Tugendlehre Schleiermachers mit spezieller Berücksichtigung der Tugendlehre Platons. Erlangen (Leipzig: Gräfe), 1889. Pp. 62, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

KUNST, H. Geschichte der Legenden der heiligen Katharina von Alexandrien und der heiligen Maria Aegyptiaca, nebst unedierten Texten. Halle: Niemeyer, 1890. Pp. iii., 340, 8vo, 8 mk.

LATCH, E. B. Indications of the Book of Job. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. Pp. 293, \$1.00.

LICHTENBERGER, F. History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century. Translated and edited by W. Hastie. New York: Scribner & Welford. 8vo, cloth, \$5.00.

LIGGINS, John. The Great Value and Success of Foreign Missions, Proved by Distinguished Witnesses. New York: Baker & Taylor Co. Pp. 249, 16 mo, paper, 35 cts.; cloth, 75 cts.

LOOFS, Friedrich (Prof. Theol., Halle). Die Handschriften der Lateinischen Uebersetzung des Irenaeus und ihre Kapiteltheilung. (Abdruck aus den Kirchengeschichtlichen Studien.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1890. Pp. 93, 8vo, paper, 55 cts.

LUMHOLZ, Carl, M.A. Among Cannibals. An account of four years' travel in Australia and of camp life with the aborigines of Queensland. Translated by Rasmus B. Anderson, Ex-United States Minister to Denmark. With portrait, maps, four chromolithographs, and woodcuts. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1889. Pp. xx., 395, 8vo, \$5.00.

LUTHERAN ALMANAC and Year-Book for 1890, No. 20. Edited by Matthias Sheeleigh, D. D. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1889. Pp. 72, sq. 16mo, paper, 10 cts.

McCOSH, James, D.D., LL.D., etc. Whither? O Whither? Tell Me Where. New York: Scribner's Sons. 12mo, paper, 50 cts net.

McFARLANE, S., Rev. Among the Cannibals of New Guinea; being the Story of the New Guinea Mission of the London Missionary Society. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1889. Pp. 192, cloth, \$1.00.

MACLAY, Arthur Collins, A.M., LL.B. Mito Yashiki. A tale of old Japan. A feudal romance descriptive of the decline of the Shogunate and of the downfall of the power of the Tokugawa family. New York and London: Putnam's Sons, 1889. Pp. viii., 456, 12mo, \$1.50.

MAGOUN, G. F. Asa Turner and his Times. Boston: Congregational Sunday School & Publication Society. \$1.75.

MAIR, Alexander, Rev. Studies in the Christian Evidences. New and revised edition. New York: Scribner & Welford. Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

MANDEL, Th. H. Kephars der Evangelist. Studien zur Evangelienfrage. Leipzig: Dörrfling & Franke, 1889. Pp. 139, 12mo, paper, 75 cts.

MANNING, Jacob Merrill, D.D. (Late Pastor of the Old South Church, Boston). Sermons. With steel portrait. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

MAURICE, F. D. The Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven. A course of lectures on the Gospel of Luke. New York: Macmillan, 1889. Pp. xlviii., 398, 16mo, cloth, \$1.75.

MAYOR, John E. B. The Latin Heptateuch. Published piecemeal by the French printer, W. Morel (1860), and the French Benedictines, E. Martine (1733) and J. B. Pitra (1852), critically reviewed. New York: Macmillan, 1889. Pp. lxxiv., 268, 8vo, cloth, \$3.00.

MEAD, C. M. Supernatural Revelation. An essay concerning the basis of the Christian Faith. (Princeton Lectures.) New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.

MELANCHTHON, Philip. Die Loci communes Philipp Melanchthons in ihrer Uebersalt nach G. L. Platt in zweiter Auflage von neuem herausgegeben und erläutert von Th. Kolde, Professor der Theologie, Erlangen. Erlangen und Leipzig: Böhme, 1890. Pp. viii., 273, 8vo paper, \$1.30.

MERCER, Alexander Gardiner, D.D. Christ and His Teachings. New York: Randolph & Co. 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.

MICHEL, —. Die römische Kirche, ihre Einwirkung auf die germanischen Stämme und das deutsche Volk. Halle: Niemeyer, 1889. Pp. viii., 421, 8vo, 7 mk.

MOORE, Aubry L., Rev., M.A. Science and the Faith. Essays on Apologetic Subjects. (From the London Guardian.) New York: James Pott & Co. 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

MURPHY, Thomas, D.D. The Presbytery of the Log College; or, the Cradle of the Presbyterian Church in America. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 628, \$2.00.

NESTLE, E. De Sancta Cruce. Ein Beitrag zur christlichen Legenden Geschichte. Berlin: Reuter, 1889. Pp. viii., 128, 8vo, 4 mk.

NEWTON, William Wilberforce. William Augustus Muhlenberg. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 16mo, cloth, \$1.25.

ORELLI, C. von. The Prophecies of Jeremiah. (Clark's Theological Library.) New York: Scribner & Welford. 8vo, \$3.00.

PARKER, Joseph, D.D. The People's Bible: Discourses upon Holy Scripture. The Book of Job. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. Pp. vii., 454, 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.

PATON, John G. (Missionary to the New Hebrides). An Autobiography. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. \$1.50.

PELOUBET, F. N. and M. A. A Commentary on the International Lessons for 1890. Explanatory, illustrative, doctrinal and practical; with illustrations, maps, pictures, chronology, and harmony of the Life of Christ. . . . Studies in the Gospel according to Luke. Boston: Wilde & Co., 1889. Pp. 343, 8vo, cloth, \$1.25.

PERTHES' Handlexikon für evangelische Theologen. Ein Nachschlagebuch für das Gesamtgebiet der wissenschaftlichen und praktischen Theologie. Völlständig bis Ende 1890 in 3 Bänden. 1. Lieferung (A-Ana). Gotha: Perthes, 1890. Pp. 80, 8vo, paper, 40 cts.

PETAVEL, E., D.D. (Free Lecturer, University of Geneva, Switzerland.) The Extinction of Evil. Three theological essays. Translated with an introductory chapter, by Charles H. Oliphant. The Preface by Rev. Edward White, London. Boston: Charles H. Woodman, 1889. Pp. xii., 184, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

PHELPS, Elizabeth Stuart. The Struggle for Immortality. Essays. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 16mo, \$1.25.